FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 116 *17 June 1985*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Reagan SALT Statement Blind to 'Disinform Public' AA 1
[Korionov in PRAVDA 15 Jun]
Warnke Criticizes Statement AA 2
Kondrashov Views Decision AA 2
U.S. Preparing for First Nuclear Strike Delivery AA 4
[Kharkov]
Joint Commission on SALT I Signs Understandings AA 5
CDE Delegates Debate Proposals on No Use of Force AA 5

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

PRAVDA Editorial Article on CEMA Role, Tasks BB 1
[15 Jun]
CEMA Secretary Interviewed on Progress, Plans BB 7
[Korzin]
Soviet Forces' Group, GDR Army Exercises 6-14 July BB 10
Hungarian, CSSR, USSR Forces Plan Exercises BB 10
[Budapest]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'International Situation: Questions & Answers' CC 1
[Kachanov, Cheporov]
SALT II Treaty CC 1
Soviet-U.S. Parity CC 2
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 4
[Beglov, Kolchanov, Zholkver]
Socialist, Capitalist Economies Contrasted CC 4
Unemployment in West CC 5
Common Market Versus U.S. CC 6
Conflict Over SDI CC 7
Gandhi Visit to U.S. CC 9
Zagladin Writes on Soviet Foreign Policy CC 10
[NEW TIMES No 23]
Moscow Notes 'Global Shield-85,' Other Maneuvers CC 16
IAEA Lauds USSR Agreement on Nuclear Monitoring CC 17
International TU Committee Discusses Disarmament CC 17

UNITED STATES & CANADA

TASS Notes U.S. Reaction to TWA 847 Hijacking A 1
USSR Expels U.S. Diplomat for Espionage Activity A 1
TASS Cites Gandhi's Remarks to U.S. Congress A 1
House Vote for Aid to Contras Denounced A 2
[Listov in PRAVDA 14 Jun]
Kondrashov on House Vote, Changing Public Opinion A 3
Rescinded Clark Amendment Shows U.S. for Terrorism A 4
[Tarutin in PRAVDA 14 Jun]
Kornilov Views U.S. Policy of Exporting Terrorism A 5
U.S. Postponing Decision on Military Aid to Jordan A 6
U.S.-USSR Activities in Space Contrasted A 7
[Krasikov]
U.S. LHX Program Described in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA A 8
[Boyko, 5 Jun]
Manitoba Proclaims Itself Nuclear-Free Zone A 8

CHINA

USSR-PRC Consular Talks in Beijing 'Businesslike' B 1
USSR, PRC Sign Cultural Cooperation Plan for 1985 B 1
PRC Tourist Group Continues Trip, Visits Yerevan B 1
Amity Group Sponsors Meeting for PRC Students B 1
NEW TIMES Assesses 1925-27 Chinese Revolution B 2
[Kartunova, No 23, June]

NORTHEAST ASIA

Japanese Defense Chief's U.S. Visit Viewed C 1
Tsvetov on Koichi Kato's Anti-Soviet Statements C 2
Japanese Policy Plays Into Hands of Pentagon C 3
[Biryukov]
TASS: Japan 'Dazzled' by U.S. Space Plans C 4
Dmitriyev on Japan as Major U.S. Nuclear Base C 5
More U.S. Arms Stockpiles in Japan 'Provocative' C 6
[Vinogradov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Jun]
TASS on Japan's Plans To Acquire AWACS System C 7
U.S. Fosters Closer Japan-ROK Military Links C 7
[Andrianov]
TASS: U.S. 'Special Units' Train in S. Korea C 8

WESTERN EUROPE

Reportage, Comment on Agca Trial Continues G 1
TASS Issues Statement G 1
CIA Involvement Alleged G 1
Ponomarev Leads Supreme Soviet Delegation to Spain G 2
'Positive Changes' Noted G 3

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

South Lebanon Army Releases Finnish UN Troops H 1
Olin on Israel's Withdrawal From Lebanon H 1
TASS: Lebanon Leaders View Israeli Pullout H 2

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

PRAVDA Editorial on Scientific-Technical Progress [14 Jun] R 1
Soviet Official Says Sakharov 'Alive and Well' [AFP] R 4

REAGAN SALT STATEMENT BLIND TO 'DISINFORM PUBLIC'

PM141900 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jun 85 First Edition p 5

[Vitaliy Korionov "Political Observer's Notes": "Deception Is Not Succeeding"]

[Text] Washington is mobilizing all the forces of the White House and State Department apparatus, the press, and the other news media. More and more new "arguments" are being invented with the aim of obscuring the true meaning of the decision made by the White House a few days ago regarding U.S. policy on the SALT II treaty. People are being assured in every way: Nothing dangerous is happening; on the contrary, Washington is actually taking a step in favor of peace and the preservation of Soviet-U.S. agreements. "The President has chosen arms control, not the tough line on which he 'rode' into the White House. Reagan has taken to his bosom a treaty that he repeatedly called 'disastrously wrong,'" THE WASHINGTON POST emotionally assures people, for instance.

However, the true situation is so self-evident that even those who have been told to add a little luster to the White House's unattractive stance keep on letting the cat out of the bag, effectively admitting that this is merely a blind designed to disinform public opinion, and, moreover, a blind that is the forced result of the circumstances in which Washington finds itself. Its course of cranking up the arms race in all directions and of removing all the obstacles that impede this is legitimately causing concern not only to the broad international public but also to ordinary Americans and the U.S. NATO allies.

Certain U.S. press organs are publicly admitting that the White House only wants to get a temporary respite in order to draw fire away from itself, place the blame on the other side, and confront the world with the fait accompli of the total transformation of the SALT II treaty into a "scrap of paper." It is inconvenient to state openly that Washington is reneging on the treaty: After all, in that case all the peace-loving camouflage would vanish. The peoples' gaze is riveted on Geneva, where the new talks with the United States on nuclear and space armaments, talks that were suggested by the Soviet Union, are under way. Washington is certainly not planning to reach an effective agreement, however. On the other hand, people in the U.S. capital have no intention for even a minute of curtailing the implementation of the giant armament program. "The Pentagon," THE NEW YORK TIMES writes plainly, "has sufficient powers to plan more serious violations of the treaty: tests of the Midgetman missile as an addition to, rather than instead of, the MX, and also tests of exotic technology jeopardizing the most important of all agreements -- the ABM Treaty."

The remarks of G. Will, an extreme right-wing newspaper commentator whose views are close to those of the White House, are typical. In an article in NEWSDAY he describes virtually as idiots those American advocates of continuing the arms limitation process who believed that Reagan "had joined their ranks and guaranteed the durability of SALT II." The President's ideas and views are "simply incompatible with compliance with SALT II," he admits.

For its part, THE WASHINGTON POST notes in an editorial: "Reagan told Defense Secretary Weinberger and other advocates of violating SALT II: 'Wait another 5 months, then you will be able to tell me about additional measures to build up armaments.'" Journalist D. Oberdorfer adds: Reagan's decision "was characterized in official statements as a temporary stance for a particular moment, and not for all time."

The White House press release circulated 10 June announces with the utmost clarity: "The Department of Defense will conduct a comprehensive assessment aimed at identifying specific actions which the United States could take to accelerate or augment as necessary [dlya neobkhodimogo uskoreniya ili dopolneniya] the U.S. strategic modernization program...."

The date when the Pentagon will submit the corresponding proposal has also been decided: November this year.

The true meaning of the White House's manipulations is becoming clear to world public opinion. Press organs that do not even adopt a disloyal position with regard to Washington are writing openly of this. Here are some of these remarks. "The U.S. president is clearly trying to reassure his West European allies" (Paris LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS); "President Reagan's statement is chiefly aimed at lessening the concern felt by the West European NATO countries and Japan at the worsening prosects of reaching agreement at the Geneva talks" (Japan's MAINICHI); "Doubts remain. It is not clear from the U.S. Administration's statement whether it will adhere to the agreed procedure for destroying missiles exceeding the ceiling established by SALT II or will merely take a Poseidon submarine out of service but not destroy its missles" (Britain's the GUARDIAN). No, the transatlantic missile worshipers are not succeeding in camouflaging their true intentions. It is becoming clear that Washington is merely seeking ways of gradually sliding out of the SALT II treaty.

Warnke Criticizes Statement

LD151312 Moscow TASS in English 1207 GMT 15 Jun 85

[Text] Washington June 15 TASS -- Paul Warnke, former director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, has stated it is no wonder that the Soviet side has regarded without enthusiasm President Reagan's statement on the U.S. policy with regard to SALT-2.

Speaking here at a conference of the Committee for National Security, he described as a false note the words contained in the President's statement about the "need" to seek progress within the framework of the talks in Geneva on nuclear arms while keeping silent on the talks on space armaments.

Mr. Warnke recalled that the understanding that the two sides would seek the prevention of an arms race in outer space and an end to it on earth served as the basis for the start of the Geneva talks. He pointed out that an attempt at changing the formula of the talks is incompatible with progress at them. Mr. Warnke criticized the administration-launched campaign of groundless accusations levelled at the Soviet Union as to "violations" of the provisions of the SALT-2 treaty. He also pointed out the need to observe the 1972 Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems of 1972. The Reagan administration is known to have taken a course towards undermining the treaty.

William Sexton, columnist of the paper NEWSDAY, writes that what the USA needs is the SALT-2 treaty, and not "star wars." The history of the arms race confirms that the arms race did not strengthen U.S. security a bit while compelling the Soviet Union to give an adequate reply to any U.S. step. Most specialists in the military field hold that "star wars" will have the same negative effect on U.S. security as the hydrogen bomb and MIRV's. The newspaper DAILY WORLD emphasizes that the Reagan administration's decision to observe on the whole the provisions of the SALT-2 treaty has no sense without U.S. practical steps in this field.

Kondrashov Views Decision

LD162344 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 16 Jun 85

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Stanislav Kondrashov]

[Text] Forums in Washington have been wondering once again how to deal with the problem and process of control over nuclear weapons.

As before, the issue was the fate of the treaty for the limitation of strategic weapons, SALT-II. It is well known that this treaty determines how many, and what sort of, nuclear weapon carriers may be held by the two nuclear powers, the Soviet Union and the United States. I would remind you that the treaty was signed in 1979 by U.S. President Carter, but was not ratified by the Senate. President Reagan has declared it dead on more than one occasion. No one can deny that the treaty is a long-suffering one, but it is tenacious, too. It has turned out to be not quite so easy to bury it, because of resistance from the American public, from the United States' Western European allies, and because of the position of many in the U.S. Congress.

It was not easy to bury it, and as Reagan has come to understand, also unwise; he has decided to adapt it for his own ends, carrying out, supposedly within the framework of the treaty, modernization of the U.S. strategic forces. Yet, now the treaty's "shirt" has got a little tight for the new weapons which have grown up over the 4 and a bit years of the Reagan administration, during which the stupendous sum of $1 trillion has been spent for military purposes.

Among the key clauses Washington was supposed to observe was the restriction on ballistic missiles with subprojectile or multiple warheads: 1,200 and no more of such missiles. However, in America the gigantic submarine Alaska, the seventh of the new Ohio-class submarines, and with 24 perfected multiple-warhead Trident missiles, will be operational by autumn. With this addition the set limit will be exceeded by 14 missiles -- 1,214 instead of 1,200.

In order not to violate the treaty it is necessary to dismantle one of the earlier Poseidon-class submarines with its 16 missiles. President Reagan was to report on his decision to Congress before 1 June, but he postponed it to 10 June since such bitter arguments flared up within his administration and throughout Washington's political circles. The superhawks, especially Weinberger, the secretary of defense, demanded that the SALT-II treaty be ditched without more ado, and that the Poseidon submarine remain, with its missiles, among the submarines in service. The moderates, grouping themselves around Secretary of State Shultz, understand that such a provocative course would have a fatal effect on the current Soviet-U.S. negotiations in Geneva: The Reagan administration would stand before the entire world as an open opponent weapons control, and it would aggravate U.S. relations with the NATO allies who are already alarmed by the new U.S. militarist plans.

We do not have time to give you the details of the upheavals in the latest internal political juggling in Washington, but in short, President Reagan decided after all to dismantle the Poseidon submarine we mentioned. At the same time, he made arrangements to continue increasing the U.S. strategic forces and announced that he would make a final decision on a course of action later, examining each case on an individual basis, in the light of the Russians' actions.

The Soviet appraisal of the President's decision has been given in a special TASS statement in which it is said that the United States has embarked on the road of constantly worming its way out of the treaty, of throwing away, one after the other, the very restrictions it had stipulated. Furthermore, the U.S. decision is qualified thus: No one should be under any illusion that the U.S. side will be allowed to determine arbitrarily which obligations will be observed and which will not, the TASS statement says; to expect that the other side will play along with such a line on the part of the United States is a dangerous illusion.

As far as the reaction to the President's decision in America is concerned, liberal observers speak about the defeat of hawks like Weinberger and are glad that a chance for the negotiations in Geneva has been preserved.

However, the conservative observer George Will writes that they, that is his liberal colleagues, underestimate Reagan's cunning. Reagan is sacrificing one submarine for the sake of keeping the allies and the Senate quiet, Will writes. These allies and the Senate will find it more difficult to act when he takes his next step against SALT-II.

U.S. PREPARING FOR FIRST NUCLEAR STRIKE DELIVERY

LD162031 Moscow TASS in English 1859 GMT 16 Jun 85

["Counting on First-Strike Weapons" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS -- TASS news analyst Vasily Kharkov writes:

The third anniversary of the Soviet Union's solemn pledge that it unilaterally undertakes not to be the first to use nuclear weapons is marked on these June days. The USSR urged the other nuclear powers to assume a similar obligation. That was a truly historic act which is of immense international importance. Grateful mankind will always remember this major initiative which reflects the Soviet Union's principled peaceful course. Should the USA and its allies possessing nuclear weapons assume such an obligation, the situation in the world would become different, much more stable, and the international security would become much stronger. But Washington did not heed the call and, as facts show, has diametrically opposite goals, intensively preparing for the delivery of a first nuclear strike. Another evidence of that is provided by an article published in today's Sunday supplement to the newspaper WASHINGTON POST.

The article says that high-ranking spokesmen of the Pentagon admit that new weapons systems which are being added to the U.S. strategic nuclear arsenal, such as the MX intercontinental ballistic missiles and the submarine-launched Trident missile, are specially designed to enable the USA to deliver a preemptive strike against the Soviet Union. The article points out that one of Pentagon generals has stated that if a nuclear war breaks out, it would be started by the United States.

As is seen, the build-up of first-strike nuclear capability with an eye to impunity underlies the U.S. military-strategic plans. And since the SALT-II treaty does not fit into those plans, Washington seeks to crawl out of it, discarding one treaty-provided limit after another.

Washington does not even think of any limitation on the nuclear arms race. Assertions which are being spread that the President's "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) is a non-nuclear programme turn out in actual fact to be neither more nor less than enticing publicity. The paper NEWSDAY on Saturday [15 June] carried a report on Secret Directive 172 which was issued on May 30, this year, by the National Security Council. The directive said that nuclear weapons should become one of the elements of the programme. So, Washington has taught an object-lesson to those who still entertained some illusions about the true purpose of the SDI.

The present U.S. Administration over the four years of its stay in office has spent more than 1,007,000 million dollars for military purposes, shattering all records. Expenditures on nuclear weapons rose in a particularly rapid way. They have trebled since 1980. All this indicates that Washington does not even think of abandoning the path of the deadly race of nuclear arms. On the contrary, it intends to spiral it up still more.

JOINT COMMISSION ON SALT I SIGNS UNDERSTANDINGS

LD141251 Moscow TASS in English 1229 GMT 14 Jun 85

[Text] Geneva June 14 TASS -- The Soviet-American Standing Consultative Commission, which has been set up to facilitate the implementation of the aims and provisions of the Treaty on the Limitation of Antiballistic Missile Systems and the Interim Agreement on Certain Measures With Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed by the USSR and the United States on May 26, 1972, and the Agreement on Measures To Reduce the Risk of Outbreak of Nuclear War, signed by the two countries on September 30, 1971, ended another session here today.

In the context of these common aims the sides signed during the session a common understanding aimed at further enhancing the viability of the ABM Treaty and a common understanding concerning the use of immediate notifications in connection with the agreement on measures to reduce the risk of outbreak of nuclear war between the USSR and the United States.

CDE DELEGATES DEBATE PROPOSALS ON NO USE OF FORCE

LD141534 Moscow TASS in English 1512 GMT 14 Jun 85

[Text] Stockholm June 14 TASS -- TASS correspondents Nikolay Vukolov and Aleksandr Stepanenko report:

Keen political debates have unfolded nowadays at the Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe that is taking place in the Swedish capital over the socialist countries' proposal to conclude a treaty banning the use of military force.

The conclusion of such a treaty, the chief Soviet delegate, Ambassador at Large Oleg Grinevskiy, has stated, would be a manifestation of resolve on the part of the European countries, the USA and Canada to embrace a course of strengthening the foundations of peaceful cooperation. However, the policy of the USA and its closest NATO allies is an obstacle to this treaty. Although they had to agree to discuss the non-use of force on the proposal of the socialist countries, nothing so far shows that they intend to tackle that most important problem in all seriousness. Debates show that the United States has come to this session empty-handed again and that it is trying to make do with general rhetoric. That destructive approach, the Soviet delegate stressed, substantially holds back the progress of the Stockholm forum.

The arguments of the USA and its allies against the socialist countries' proposals on the non-use of force are unconvincing and look like attempts to avoid businesslike discussion. The U.S. delgate Lyn Hansen claimed, for instance, that the best manifestation of the states' obligation not to use force would be the adoption of NATO's measures. However, NATO's proposals for the most part are aimed at securing unilateral advantage for the North Atlantic alliance and at "X-raying" the structure and activity of the Armed Forces of the USSR and its allies to the detriment of their security but have nothing to do with the principle of the non-use of force. Statements by the West German delegate Klaus Zitron, who paid lip service to non-use of force, actually also boiled down to advertizing NATO's proposals.

As the Bulgarian delegate, Ambassador S. Todorov, justly pointed out, those attempts of the NATO countries to substitute their narrow measures of a military-technical nature for the effective obligations on the non-use of military force could not be a solution of the problem that is expected from the conference by the peoples of Europe.

PRAVDA EDITORIAL ARTICLE ON CEMA ROLE, TASKS

PM161500 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jun 85 First Edition p 4

[Editorial article: "Internationalism in Action"]

[Text] the peoples of the fraternal community countries are successfully implementing Lenin's prediction that the "new socialist edifice" would be built by their mutual efforts. Under the leadership of their communist and workers parties they are implementing the development strategy elaborated a year ago by the CEMA countries' economic summit conference in Moscow. This is a long-term program for further intensifying the socialist community states' collaboration with a view to accelerating socioeconomic development and scientific and technical progress, intensifying the national economy in every possible way, equalizing the fraternal countries' development levels, and increasing working people's prosperity.

It is of particular significance at this time, when many of the community countries' communist and workers parties have embarked on the period of their regular congresses, which shape the socialist economic management strategy for the long term.

The internal conditions of socialist and communist building that have taken shape in the mid-eighties are insistently posing the task of intensifying the fraternal countries' national economies in every way, and one of the main preconditions for success in this process is the fuller utilization of the advantages of division of labor among them and the deepening of their economic integration. Furthermore, as the scale of production expands, the satisfaction of the economy's fuel, raw material, and manpower needs becomes more complex. On the other hand, the role of integration factors intensifies in the course of the scientific and technological revolution. In brief, to solve key problems of creation more successfully it is necessary to broaden the scale of and impart a new quality to the fraternal states' international cooperation. There is no other way.

The external conditions -- characterized by the fueling of the threat of a nuclear missile conflict from the most aggressive circles of imperialism -- are unfavorable. In the West's international economic ties there is increasingly frequent recourse to the language of diktat, with embargoes, boycotts, and other discriminatory measures being applied agianst the socialist countries. Sharp swings in world market conditions are occuring and competition is becoming tougher.

From all viewpoints the situation requires even greater cohesion and unity among the socialist community countries, a high level of activeness in pursuing a peace-loving Leninist foreign policy, and the strengthening of the Warsaw Pact through joint efforts. They will continue to counter the intensification of the war threat with the alternative of the consolidation of universal peace and security, cooperation among all states irrespective of their social system, and constructive collaboration in all spheres of life.

Thus the objective processess of social development today dictate the need to strengthen the unity and cohension of the peoples following the path of socialism and deepen international socialist division of labor.

The interests of socialist society's progress dictate the need to constantly increase the ruling communist and workers parties' leading role as the scale and complexity of the tasks of social transformations grow. Communists bear the main responsibility for determining the general prospects for the development of society and a political course encompassing long-term objectives and current tasks.

Through their policy the fraternal countries' communist and workers parties also ensure the correct combination of national and international interests and take into consideration the general natural laws of socialist building and the specific historical conditions of each given country. Communists consider it their supreme duty to maintain loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism at all times and in all things and to further strengthen unity and cohesion.

It is on this basis that the fraternal parties adopt their collective decisions and, in particular, eleborate the main guidelines for the long-term strategy for economic development and the deepening of mutual cooperation. Party leadership of the elaboration and implementation of economic policy has been and remains an immutable principle of ruling communist and workers parties' activity and a law of socialism.

With a view to intensifying collective work to develop cooperation and exchange experience of economic building a joint decision was adopted on a new form of collaboration -- annual conferences of central committee secretaries responsible for economic questions from the fraternal parties.

The first such meeting took place in May this year. Its participants shared information on the parties' work to implement the accords reached at the economic conference and on forms and methods of party influence on the extensive intensification of national economies and the growth of the economic efficiency of social production. Particular attention was devoted to accelerating socioeconomic development on the basis of scientific and technological progress and developing machine building on the basis of specialiization and production sharing within the CEMA framework. Making a high assessment of the meeting of central committee secretaries for economic questions from the fraternal parties, Comrade M.S. Gorbachev stressed the need to make more in-depth use of his reserves of socialist economic integration.

The socialist community countries are achieving considerable successes in implementing their bold and realistic socioeconomic development plans. The deepening of integration processes is exerting a favorable influence on the fraternal states' economic life, coordination of their national economic plans is improving, and production, scientific, and technical cooperation is expanding.

I. The implementation of the economic conference's decisions is an invariable part of the agenda for joint work by the fraternal parties. This is most insistently required at the present time by the general interests of cooperation, the requirements of each state's socioeconomic development, and the features of the complex international situation.

As is known, the results of the conference were examined by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the central committees of all the CEMA countries' parties, which mapped out specific measures to implement in practice its injunctions on further developing socialist economic integration and implementing the jointly elaborated economic strategy for the long term.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo instructed Soviet state planning organs, ministries, departments, and organizations to make provision in the main guidelines for economic and development for the fuller use of the possibilities of cooperation to solve major national economic problems and also for the coordination of individual sectors' development and extensive production sharing.

The prospects for further comprehensive progress and the improvement of socialist society through 1990 and right through the end of the current century are currently being determined in all the community countries. In the process of this work the coordination of economic policy on questions of mutual interest is being carried out, bilateral economic, scientific, and technical cooperation programs are being elaborated and implemented, coordination of plans for the upcoming 5-year plan period is being completed, and a number of major multilateral agreements are being prepared on production sharing and joint development of natural resources, including agreements on cooperation in the field of machine building, energy, and fuel and raw material sectors.

The community countries' communist and workers parties are independent [samostoyatelnyy] in their economic policy and in determining the forms and methods for implementing the fundamental natural laws of socialist economic management. This is an immutable fact. At the same time, having common objectives, they have a vital interest in coordinating their socioeconomic strategy increasingly closely and adjusting their economic and management mechanisms. This is because socialist integration is based on mutual advantage and balance in trade and economic relations.

The Soviet Union's growing domestic requirements and the international situation necessitate major new steps in the economic sphere. In simultaneously resolving such enormous tasks as increasing the people's prosperity, strengthening the country's economic might, and maintaining reliable defenses, the CPSU has set a firm course aimed at securing a resolute turnabout toward intensification and the growth of production efficiency. This necessitates fundamental transformations in productive forces and the entire management system. The next 5-year plan period must be a turning point in this respect. It is clear that it is no easy matter to reach the top technical standard and the most sophisticated forms of economic machinery and management. It requires great efforts, creative work, and adjustments in the course of its implementation.

Work to improve the administrative and economic management system is in progress in the Soviet Union. More and more sectors are joining in the large-scale economic experiment. Increasingly extensive use in being made of the most immediate reserves -- improving organization and order and strengthening discipline and cadres' responsibility. But the main thing is that work is in progress to set in motion deep-lying factors and first and foremost to accelerate scientific and technical progress, which is the main strategic lever for intensifying the national economy. One question being posed concerns revolutionary shifts in scientific and technical progress -- that is, the transition to essentially new technical and technological systems offering the greatest efficiency -- and the retooling of all sectors of the national economy.

The CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum set the party and the Soviet people the task of achieving a substantial acceleration of socioeconomic development and reaching the top world level of social labor productivity by making extensive use of scientific and technical achievements and bringing the forms of socialist economic management into conformity with modern conditions and requirements. Particular attention here was drawn to increasing output quality in every way as the only reliable way to better satisfy society's requirements for modern equipment and the population's growing demand for diverse products.

This strategic line of the party was spelled out absolutely insistently at the recent CPSU Central Committee conference on questions of scientific and technical progress.

The other fraternal parties are also adopting a similar approach.

A year ago the CEMA countries agreed to elaborate a comprehensive program for scientific and technical progress for 15-20 years. It must become the basis for the elaboration of a coordinated and, in some areas, a unified scientific and technical policy. The need for this program is urgent. Even now, without waiting for the elaboration of this program to be completed, the CEMA countries have begun to agree among themselves on major joint steps in selected priority avenues of scientific and technical progress.

The mass introduction of electronics into the national economy, comprehensive automation, including flexible automated systems, nuclear energy, new materials and production and processing techniques, and biotechnology are such avenues.

The time has obviously come to also determine the most suitable forms for the collective management of scientific and technical progress.

Problems of deepening specialization, cooperation, and mutual division of labor in science, technology, and production are now coming to the fore. Life shows that in the modern world it is not within the power of any single country to master all types of production on an economically optimal scale and at a high technical level. But it is within the power of a unified socialist community with a solid scientific, material, and technical base and rich experience in mutual ties.

II. In solving urgent economic problems on an integrated basis, the CPSU and the fraternal parties give priority to the development of machine building, bearing in mind the next 5-year plan's task of accelerating its growth rates by 50-100 percent and making a rapid transition to new generations of machine technology capable of revolutionizing production and sharply increasing labor productivity and the output: capital ratio. Largely thanks to the development of in-depth forms of mutual division of labor the proportion of the European CEMA countries' industrial production accounted for by this sector has reached an average of one-third and is continuing to increase. Machine building accounts for over 110 of the 150 current multilateral contracts and agreements relating to specialization and cooperation. The last 3 years have seen a 30 percent increase in the CEMA countries' machine building exports and a 60 percent increase in reciprocal exchanges of specialized output.

The CEMA countries have achieved great success in nuclear machine building through their own pooled efforts. In 1979 they adopted a program for cooperation in the fuel, raw material, and energy sectors and signed a multilateral agreement on production of nuclear power station equipment for the decade. The agreement linked together in a unified production cycle over 50 associations and enterprises in the fraternal countries, and the result of their comprehensively coordinated activity is the reciprocal production and supply of equipment for nuclear power stations with power units of 440,000 and 1 million kilowatt capacity. Nuclear power station capacities within CEMA now total 25 million kilowatts. Their use makes it possible to save 50 million tons of fuel per year.

Long-term comprehensive measures relating to cooperation in the energy, fuel, and raw materials field through 1990 and in the longer term are being implemented. To meet their energy and raw material requirements the CEMA countries are creating on a multilateral basis such major projects as the Krivoy Rog mining and enriching combine and the main gas pipeline from Yamburg to the Western border of the USSR and also capacities for extracting and processing magnesite in Czechoslovakia and nickel and cobalt products in Cuba, organizing the exploitation of bauxite deposits in Vietnam and phosphorite deposits in Mongolia and joint coal mining in Poland, and coordinating a nuclear power station construction program.

In deepening socialist integration the fraternal countries are singling out maximum resource saving as an important reserve in cooperation. It is a question of making economical and efficient use of all types of raw material, fuel, energy, and materials. This means that in our day the energy and raw material problem cannot be solved without resource-saving technologies.

An important way of further developing and deepening the CEMA countries' economic, scientific, and technical cooperation and increasing production efficiency is to establish direct ties between associations, enterprises, and organizations. Over 4,000 enterprises in the CEMA countries and many scientific research centers currently maintain direct ties.

Direct ties and close working contacts among the labor collectives of enterprises and scientific research centers and the party organizations heading them constitute the main avenue of cooperation. Every step we take toward each other ultimately accelerates our joint progress. A tremendous asset -- international experience of socialist building -- is assimilated on a reciprocal basis in contacts among millions of people.

The fraternal parties see the supreme point of accelerating their countries' socioeconomic development as being to steadily increase the people's prosperity, improve all aspects of people's life, and create favorable conditions for the harmonious development of the individual.

During the past year the DEMA countries have worked persistently to resolve the priority task of developing in every way the sectors of the agro-industrial complex and cooperation in this sphere. They are channeling their efforts toward increasing food production on the basis of the introduction of progressive technology and the development and improvement of the material and technical base of agriculture and the food industry.

The improvement of foreign economic ties plays an important role in resolving the entire package of problems of scientific and technical progress facing the fraternal countries. A new approach is also required here: In this area too more efficient use should be made of the possibilities of mutually advantageous international division of labor. For this it is particularly necessary to increase product competitiveness, stimulate enterprises' interest in working for export, and involve food products in our exchange rather more extensively. Such questions are ensuring that reciprocal supply deadlines and levels are complied with and products are of the requisite quality must not be overlooked, either. It is a question of the most stringent mutual exactingness.

The conference injunction adopted a year ago to accelerate the process of the gradual equalization of the CEMA countries' economic development levels is being consistently implemented. Fulfilling their international duty, the community's European countries are continuing to render aid on the existing just basis to Vietnam, Cuba, and Mongolia, which are building socialism in special, complex conditions. This assistance is helping to develop and increase the efficiency of the three fraternal countries' national economies and promoting their broader participation in the international socialist division of labor. Within the family of the community these countries have already achieved considerable successes in boosting their national economies.

CEMA's role in organizing the community countries' cooperation is becoming more active and growing. The activity of its organs and also of the international economic organizations created by the countries belonging to it is improving.

The fraternal socialist countries which have created this open and democratic international organization on fundamentally new foundations expect CEMA to constantly operate as an effective organizer of cooperation and the veritable headquarters of socialist economic integration. Any supranational aspirations are absolutely alien to CEMA, but the fraternal countries would like to see it as an inexhaustible generator of initiatives affecting our community's common interests. More extensive use can be made of the potential latent in CEMA.

The economic conference's important policy decisions determining long-term avenues for the fraternal state's economic collaboration, the expansion of production sharing and specialization, and the pooling of efforts in advanced avenues of science, technology, and manufacturing are being translated into practical actions. The fraternal parties are actively seeking and elaborating the most effective and efficient mechanism for cooperation among the CEMA countries and introducing forms and methods of cooperation stimulating the pooling of resources in material production, scientific research, and experimental design development projects. Their firm will and efforts are aimed at comprehensively developing and improving cooperation and strengthening our countries' friendship, which is a supreme gain and an invaluable joint asset.

III. The indivisibility of socialism and peace is an axiom. As the most progressive world system, the socialist system persistently, consistently, and unstintingly defends the future of mankind and the very existence of civilization and life on earth.

The community's fraternal parties and states are not alone in this struggle. The world's communist and workers parties, the international workers movement, the developing countries, and democratic forces are active with them.

The CEMA countries have made an invaluable contribution to these common efforts for the benefit of peace and cooperation among the peoples. The fraternal countries have confirmed their determination to act in the interests of safeguarding peace and improving international relations in the economic sphere too. They have stigmatized the course of confrontation pursued by the most aggressive imperialist circles and resolutely condemned the attempts by the United States and NATO to achieve military-strategic superiority and pursue a policy of force, interference in internal affairs, infringement of states' national independence and sovereignty, and consolidation and recarving of "spheres of influence."

The CEMA countries have countered the policy of militarist rampaging and provocations with their collectively formulated course aimed at strengthening peace and easing international tension, ending the arms race, completely and totally banning nuclear weapon tests, preventing the militarization of space, and returning international relations to the normal channel of peaceful coexistence and mutually advantageous cooperation.

The declaration "the preservation of peace and international economic cooperation" adopted by the Moscow conference noted the importance of trade, economic, scientific, and technical ties with all states. The CEMA countries are in no way supporters of autarky; they steadily expand economic, scientific, and cultural ties with all states irrespective of their social and state structure on the basis of equality, mutual benefit, and noninterference in internal affairs. Thus, for example, the CEMA countries, supporting the developing countries' demands for the restructuring of international economic relations on an equal and democratic basis and for the establishment of a just international economic order, actively cooperate with these states.

Approximately 3,900 projects have already been built in more than 100 developing countries with economic and technical assistance from CEMA states. Furthermore, over 80,000 citizens of more than 120 developing countries annually receive training in higher and secondary educational establishments in the socialist community states and over 15,000 people from 70 countries receive production training in CEMA countries.

The fraternal countries also advocate the establishment of mutually advantageous relations between CEMA and the economic organizations of both developing and capitalist countries. The CEMA countries' readiness to conclude a corresponding agreement with the EEC has also been reiterated. Our objective is the establishment of ties among all states precluding any exploitation and discrimination or the use of economic levers as an instrument for political pressure and interference in sovereign states' internal affairs.

In our complex times only the society of genuine humanitarianism and social justice has shown itself capable of rising up to defend mankind against the terrible threat. "Today," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stated at the meeting of top party and state figures from the Warsaw Pact countries in April this year, "we appeal to all the states of Europe and other continents to rise above their differences and become partners in the struggle against the new danger threatening the whole of mankind -- the danger of nuclear annihilation."

By their creative example, their consistent course of peace and cooperation in the international arena, and their struggle against the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe the socialist community countries are indisputably proving again and again that socialism is becoming increasingly the determining factor in mankind's social progress. We have every reason to look to the future with optimism.

CEMA SECRETARY INTERVIEWED ON PROGRESS, PLANS

LD142202 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 14 Jun 85

[From the "Community" program presemted by political observer Valeriy Korzin; interview with CEMA Secretary Sychev]

[Text] Exactly 1 year ago, the economic summit conference of the CEMA member-countries was taking place in Moscow. The conference defined prospects and outlined plans for the development of the socialist community for many years to come. Our guest on the "Community" program today is CEMA Secretary Vyacheslav Vladimirovich Sychev.

Vyacheslav Vladimirovich, a year is of course not a great deal of time to allow one to draw any definitive conclusions, particularly when we are talking of such long-term plans for the development of the whole of the socialist community, but still, I'd like to discuss what has already been done over this period and how the plans outlined by the economic conference in Moscow are being implemented.

[Begin recording] [Sychev] One of the main areas of the joint activities of the CEMA member-countries, over the year since the economic conference, has been the fuller coordination of economic policies in the spheres associated with mutual cooperation. This coordination has been effected principally in the course of the coordination of plans.

[Korzin] Excuse me, but we are often asked what is meant by coordination of plans. It is a concept that is frequently used in the press. Can you explain it even in general terms?

[Sychev] Just before each successive 5-year plan period, the CEMA member-countries coordinate their national economic plans. In the course of this coordination, economic interaction, as we call it, is jointly agreed for the following 5 years. Measures in the area of specialization and the coordination of joint production are agreed among the CEMA members, the appropriate volumes of reciprocal deliveries are agreed and capital investment in individual projects is coordinated in order to ensure that subsequently, when such coordination among the countries has been carried out, provision can be made -- indeed, must be made -- in the national plans for the requisite resources. Our CEMA committee for cooperation in planning activities has carried out very important consultations on the development of the national economies of the countries for the long term and on the coordination of capital investment in the agreed spheres and projects involved in our cooperation. The accords reached during such consultations are taken into account in the drafting of multilateral agreements -- agreements on specialization and the coordination of joint production, agreements on the joint construction of economic projects and agreements on scientific and technical cooperation.

Another very important aspect of the work that has been carried out during the past year is associated with the performance of the task set by the economic summit conference -- the drafting of a most important document: the integrated program for the scientific and technical progress of the CEMA members for the next 15-20 years. The measures outlined in the program embrace five priority areas, as we call them: the introduction of electronics in the national economy on the basis of the wide utilization of computer technology and microprocessor technology; comprehensive automation, including the creation of automated complexes; the accelerated development of atomic power; the creation and mastering of new generations of structural materials and new technologies; and the development of biotechnology. These areas have received particularly broad development in the world over recent years. It was stressed at the economic conference that the integrated program for the scientific and technical progress of the CEMA members must be an action program and that is why the planning bodies of our countries, the CEMA members, have been set the task of including the relevant targets in the national plans for the next 5-year plan period.

The second important task set by the economic conference was the task of qualitatively reequipping machine building, which, as we all know full well, is the basis of the development of all sectors of the national economy. In line with the tasks that have been set and on the basis of the decisions of the conference, a committee for cooperation in the field of machine building has been set up on the level of deputy heads of government of the CEMA members. The tasks of the committee include concentrating cooperation on the priority areas of machine-building development. At its first sessions this year, the committee has already defined these priority areas: the expansion of the specialized production of robots and robot-based complexes, the organization of cooperation in the development and production of flexible production systems. The decisions of the economic conference concerning the strengthening of the fuel, energy and raw material resources of the CEMA member-countries are being implemented. The 39th CEMA session which took place in Havana at the end of last October affirmed long-term comprehensive measures in this area. A number of measures aimed at the optimization of the structure of the consumption of fuel and energy have already been implemented. In particular, the concept of the long-term development of the unified power grids up to the year 2000 has already been elaborated and affirmed by the CEMA Executive Committee. With the aim of reducing the materials consumption of national income -- that is, the quantity of materials we use to obtain one unit of national income -- a program of cooperation in saving and rationally utilizing the material resources of the CEMA countries up to the year 2000 has been drawn up in line with the decisions of the economic conference. The program is already in operation.

In a word, it can undoubtedly be said that the range of tasks set by the economic summit conference of the CEMA member-countries a year ago is very broad. Naturally, they are not confined to the handful of examples I have mentioned. There is literally no sphere of our cooperation in CEMA that is not to some degree affected by the decisions of the economic conference and for which important tasks have not been defined.

[Korzin] It can be said that the first year after the economic conference in Moscow has been a year in which the great tasks set by the conference have been put into more concrete form, and from what you have said it is already clear that there are already quite specific areas in which work has begun under the plans established by the Moscow conference.

[Sychev] It has been a year in which work has developed in all the areas defined by the economic conference decisions.

[Korzin] Another question: The documents of the economic conference said that in the next few years the CEMA countries will pay particular attention to the development of the economies of Vietnam, Cuba, and Mongolia. What can you say about this?

[Sychev] It is common knowledge that in the documents that were published, the conference stressed that the CEMA member-countries consider it their internationalist duty to continue to render assistance on the existing just basis to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the Republic of Cuba, and the Mongolian People's Republic in the acceleration of the development and the raising of the efficiency of their national economies.

For Cuba, the long-term strategy for the intensive development of the economy provides for the establishment of three large complexes: an agro-industrial sugar complex, an agro-industrial food complex and a mining-metallurgical-machine building complex.

[Korzin] What is evidently intended is not so much perhaps to set up certain of the spheres you have listed, but to take them to a completely new, up-to-date stage. Take sugar, for instance -- sugar was produced in Cuba before.

[Sychev] Of course it was. But in the other spheres, what is involved is the creation of completely new sectors of the economy. It is also intended to strengthen energy resources and to build atomic power stations. Particular emphasis is being put on the establishment of a number of production fields that are fundamentally new for the Cuban economy -- for instance, machine building, the electronic and electrical-engineering industry, as well as enterprises of the chemical and petrochemical industry.

What about Mongolia? What is planned for Mongolia is the accelerated growth of the mining and fuel industries, including the development of coking coal and phosphorite deposits, and the creation of new capacities in machine building and metal working. Substantial attention in cooperation with Mongolia is being paid to the development of agriculture, and above all livestock farming, the strengthening of fodder resources.

In Vietnam, the prime tasks are those of ensuring social and economic stability, meeting the main day-to-day requirements of the population, and strengthening the position of the state sector of the economy. In the next few years, priority is being given to the accelerated growth of agriculture and the expansion of the country's export potential, and at the same time the tasks of developing the fuel, energy and raw materials industries on the basis of technical assistance and economic cooperation with other CEMA members are being formulated.

Thus, the multilateral economic, scientific and technical cooperation of the European CEMA members with Vietnam, Cuba, and Mongolia will be geared to resolving such key problems as the expansion of these countries' own sources of accumulation, ensuring full utilization of created capacities and the priority development of the agro-industrial sphere, in conjunction with the tackling of the problems of employment, raising the living standards of the population, and strengthening the export base. I should also like to say that an important condition of the long-term development of these countries' national economies is the stepping up, on the basis of cooperation, of geological prospecting work, of cooperation in training and raising the qualifications of personnel, both workers and specialists, for those production areas and industries that are currently being set up from scratch in these countries.

[Korzin] Well, Vacheslav Vladimirovich, it just remains for me to thank you for appearing on our program and for your detailed and interesting talk.

SOVIET FORCES' GROUP, GDR ARMY EXERCISES 6-14 JULY

LD141641 Moscow TASS in English 1629 GMT 14 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 14 TASS -- The group of Soviet forces in Germany and the National People's Army of the German Democratic Republic plan to hold a joint exercise in the area of Templin, Magdeburg, Jueteborg and Cottbus in the territory of the GDR from July 6 to 14, 1985.

The exercise will aim to master the interaction of different arms of the services.

It will involve ground and air force units with a total of over 25,000 servicemen.

HUNGARIAN, CSSR, USSR FORCES PLAN EXERCISE

LD141715 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1630 GMT 14 Jun 85

[Text] The United Armed Forces of the Warsaw Pact member-states in the future will hold a joint operational tactical exercise in Hungary. According to the yearly training project, the designated staff and troops of the Hungarian People's Army, the Soviet Army and the Czechoslovak People's Army will take part in this. The "Danube '85" manuever will be led by the organs of the Defense Ministry, directed by State Secretary Lieutenant General Lajos Morocz.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS & ANSWERS'

LD142218 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 14 Jun 85

["International Situation: Questions & Answers" program presented by All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator Yevgeniy Viktorovich Kachanov, with NOVOSTI political observer Edgar Anatoliyevich Cheporov]

SALT II Treaty

[Excerpt] [Kachanov] Our program receives many letters condemning the dangerous policies of the present U.S. Administration in the international arena. Such letters have been received, in particular, from Vasiliy Romanovich Dmitriyev, a war veteran living in Pavlodar; from listener Pastukhova in the town of Vyazniki in Vladimir Oblast; from Vladimir Trofimovich Luzhko from Konotop, and many others. No demagogic talk by the Reagan administration can hide from world public opinion its wish to secure military superiority over the Soviet Union. Further evidence of this is the behavior of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks, stresses Vyacheslav Nezanoskiy, a teacher from Vologda. Lidiya Vladimirovna Vlasova, a listener in Kaluga, recalls that some time ago massive public protests forced the Pentagon to abandon its plans for the deployment of neutron weapons in Western Europe. Reagan's present program, the objective of which is no create strike space armaments, is still more dangerous to the cause of peace. Our listener in Kaluga calls for peace-loving public opinion in all countries to redouble its efforts to persistently explain to all who have so far been indifferent the terrible threat the militarization of outer space will entail to the cause of peace.

Many letter writers rightly say that the testing, which is now beginning, of components in the system of antimissile defense which has space-based elements is a direct violation of the 1972 Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty. Yet this treaty is the most important agreement in the field of arms control. Treaties must be observed. This norm of relations between countries was established by mankind longer ago than one can remember, writes our regular listener Vadim Vasilyev from Leningrad. However, he continues, recent events show that Washington does not regard any accords as being a barrier on its path to world domination. Indeed, as you know, the Reagan administration intends to amputate vitally important provisions of the SALT II treaty, which, so to say, hampers the buildup of the U.S. military potential. A debate is now in progress in Washington about the fate of this agreement, whose full name is the treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms. What is the position of the participants in this debate? I am putting this question to a participant in our program, Edgar Anatoliyevich Cheporov, a political observer for the NOVOSTI news agency.

[Cheporov] The most revealing thing here, Yevgeniy Viktorovich, is the way in which official Washington raises the question of the need to revise the SALT II treaty, an agreement, it should be noted, that has not in fact been ratified by the Reagan administration. This approach is a logical consequence of the U.S. arms race policy, its policy of achieving military superiority over the USSR. Since the treaty is a barrier to implementing these adventurist aims, its reexamination was demanded. Even before he took office, President Reagan described the SALT II treaty as being fatally flawed. Very recently, on 10 May this year, he said there is no need for the United States to go on observing the SALT II treaty. There is a debate within the administration about whether the treaty's obligations should be renounced altogether or whether the renunciation should be done in stages. The reaction to this discussion, both in the United States itself and in the camp of the U.S. allies, has proved to be extremely negative. The Senate, for example, adopted a resolution calling on the administration to desist from undermining existing agreements in the field of offensive strategic arms.

Senator Edward Kennedy declared that those who are seeking to undermine the SALT II treaty are more concerned with finding ways to block the process of arms limitation than with the security of Americans. Washington cannot, of course, ignore the views of its Atlantic partners either. That is why in his policy statement on 10 June the President did not dare announce an open, categorical renunciation of his obligations. But does this make any real difference? The other day an editorial in THE WASHINGTON POST said: Reagan is balancing between fiercely competing groups within his administration. Basically, what he is saying to Secretary of State Shultz and the other supporters of the policy of refusing to undermine the treaty is: I am giving you 5 months to demonstrate that this will lead to similar restraint on the part of the USSR, to the Soviet Union's adopting an honest approach at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons. To Defense Secretary Weinberger, the paper went on, and other figures who would like to consign the SALT II treaty to the rubbish heap he said: Be patient for 5 months. Then you can tell me what further steps in the construction of armaments would be an appropriate and balanced response to the military consequences of Soviet violations which it has not been possible to eliminate.

The reason for Reagan's balancing act is quite obvious. Washington intends to use the SALT II treaty as an instrument to put pressure on the USSR at the Geneva talks. It turns out that the Americans will carry out their obligations depending on whether, in their view, the Russians behave well at Geneva.

But this is overt blackmail, blackmail that is backed up with the threat to start a massive undermining of the SALT II treaty. In keeping the balance between the doves and the hawks, the President is heading for one objective: to destroy the system of treaties that restrains the arms race. The conditions and reservations that the U.S. President is attaching to fulfillment of the treaty show that, as the TASS statement notes, the United States has finally decided to gradually crawl out of the treaty and to cast off the restrictions imposed by it, one by one. It intends to amputate its vitally important provisions to the extent that they impede the implementation of planned programs for the creation and buildup of strategic armaments.

[Kachanov] Edgar Anatoliyevich, I do not think it would be amiss to recall which specific accords Washington strikes at with its policy.

Soviet-U.S. Parity

[Cheporov] When the SALT II treaty was signed, Yevgeniy Viktorovich, an approximate parity in the quanity and quality of the two powers' strategic nuclear armaments had become a generally recognized fact. During the process of drafting the treaty, experts from both sides came to the conclusion that there was an approximate equality in carriers. One side had 2,500 and the other side had about 2,300. The United States had and still has more nuclear warheads. However, when it took over from the Carter administration, which signed the treaty, Reagan's team began claiming that there was no equality between the USSR and the United States, and that the USSR had greatly overtaken the United States in strategic armaments.

The falsity of these claims was obvious. After all, it is inconceivable that in just 1 or 2 years the Soviet Union could have achieved superiority, let alone a substantial superiority, in strategic arms, which take many years to create. Or perhaps they uncovered some unexpected facts, which had not been taken into account before. No, no new facts of this kind had appeared.

Here is another aspect of the problem. In its comparison of the number of munitions available to the nuclear forces, the Pentagon deliberately underestimates the U.S. total by almost 2,000 units. On the other hand, it exaggerates the Soviet total by including munitions that the Pentagon believes may appear in the future. I would also add that Washington is including the Soviet medium bomber, known in the West as "Backfire," in the total of strategic armaments, even though the United States itself admitted that this aircraft has nothing to do with strategic armaments when it signed the SALT II treaty. At the same time, they are ignoring the existence of U.S. forward-based nuclear systems. Such a system of calculating the strength of the two sides cannot fail to give rise to a startling disparity in evaluations emanating from the U.S. ruling circles. On several occasions one authoritative figure has claimed that the Russians have a fivefold advantage in a certain type of strategic armaments, at the same time that another was assuring everybody that the advantage was in fact eightfold. Then evidence would appear that discredited both sets of far-fetched figures.

For example, U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger stated that the Russians are many times stronger. But in their report to Congress in 1984, the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. Armed Forces acknowledged the following: At present, there is an approximate nuclear parity between the United States and the Soviet Union. However, one should bear in mind that such information is published for a select group of people, whereas the speeches about the imaginary superiority of the Russians are intended for the millions.

Soviet, U.S. Violations

[Kachanov] Well, in planning violations of treaty obligations, the administration intends to present them as measures that are allegedly being taken in retaliation for so-called Soviet violations. What are the arguments about mythical Soviet violations based on?

[Cheporov] Neither the President nor his entourage can, of course, produce any weighty proof of such violations. But when it comes to fabrications and disinformation, the U.S. leaders lack nothing. Here is a typical example: Washington claims that the Soviet Union has a second, a new type of ICBM, the SS-25 missile. It pretends that the old SS-13 missile, which is being modernized in strict conformity with the SALT II treaty, is a new missile. References to this Soviet missile are being made in order to give the United States the right to violate one of the key provisions of the treaty by developing yet another strategic missile, the Midgetman, in addition to the MX missile. Incidentally, Washington decided to develop this missile and announced its decision long before the fabrications about the SS-25 missile were put about. There is only one purpose behind the charges against the USSR: to distract public attention from real breaches of the SALT II treaty by the United States itself. An example is the deployment of Pershing II ballistic missiles and cruise missiles in Western Europe. These first-strike nuclear weapons, which can strike targets inside the Soviet Union, are a clear addition to the U.S. strategic nuclear potential and undermine the strategic balance between our countries, which is prescribed by the SALT II treaty.

The "star wars" program pursues the same goal, the achievement of military superiority over the USSR. Together with the buildup of offensive strategic weapons, this program envisages the creation of strike space weapons and a large-scale system of so-called antimissile defense.

In August this year, the Pentagon intends to begin sea trials of the new nuclear submarine Alaska, which will carry 24 MIRVed Trident missiles. By arming itself with this new submarine-missile complex, the United States will break through the threshold of 1,200 strategic multiple warhead missiles set by the SALT-II treaty.

The Soviet position on Reagan's statement about the SALT II treaty is clear. We believe both sides should unswervingly observe the accords. Washington must clearly understand the consequences of the White House stand on the SALT II treaty. It should not be deluded into thinking that the United States will be allowed to arbitrarily decide which obligations will be observed and which will not. It is a dangerous delusion to expect that the other side will play along with this line of the United States. The Soviet Union will draw corresponding conclusions from all this, which are dictated by the interests of its security and the security of its allies.

[Kachanov] Thank you, Edgar Anatoliyevich.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD162046 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 16 Jun 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Spartak Ivanovich Beglov, NOVOSTI political observer, Rudolf Georgiyevich Kolchanov, deputy editor in chief of TRUD, and Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver, All-Union Radio and Central Television political observer]

Socialist, Capitalist Economies Contrasted

[Text] [Zholkver] Hello, Comrades! The press, radio, and television in many countries have recently been widely commenting on Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report at the CPSU Central Committee conference on questions of accelerating scientific and technological progress. They stress here that the things at issue are a new qualitative development of the Soviet economy, a rapid movement forward in strategically important directions, a restructuring of production, a switch to an intensive path and effective forms of management, and a more comprehensive solution to social problems. Many of the numerous reports on international events vividly illustrate the urgency and importance of the ideas set out in the report. Let us take for example the question of the effectiveness with which the possibilities of the mutually-beneficial international division of labor -- primarily, naturally, between the CEMA countries -- are used. It is now exactly 1 year since the CEMA economic summit was held in Moscow. At that time, in June 1984, the leaders of communist and workers parties and the heads of government discussed the most important questions relating to the current stage and prospects for the economic development and mutual cooperation of the fraternal countries, and they came to a unanimous agreement on the need for and urgency of further expanding the scale of that cooperation and increasing its efficiency. One of the latest examples is that during the recent visit by Comrade Husak to Moscow, a program was signed for long-term economic, scientific, and technological cooperation between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia up to the year 2000. Last week in Prague, there was a session of the Czechoslovak parliament, where budget performance last year was discussed, and it was stressed there that cooperation within the framework of socialist economic integration and production coordination and specialization with the socialist countries are of fundamental importance for Czechslovakia. Naturally, the problem of intensifying production has great social importance, too. True, these problems are solved differently in the socialist and the capitalist states. In our country -- and this was stressed once again at the CPSU Central Committee conference -- the curtailment of social programs is ruled out. But what about the capitalist countries? What would you say about this, Rudolf Georgiyevich, as editor of a trade union newspaper?

[Kolchanov] Perhaps, we should single out the Common Market countries, out of the capitalist countries, for several reasons. First, because the number of Common Market countries has now increased to 12 following the signing of an accession treaty by Portugal and Spain, which in fact took place last week.

[Zholkver] Yes, in fact they have just signed it.

Unemployment in West

[Kolchanov] And second, a lot is now being written and said in the West -- with no particular optimism, however -- about the economic revival in the Common Market. They don't mention, however, that it is a phase of cyclic upturn or that it is not a recovery from all the calamities that are inherent in capitalism. They forget to add that even this mild revival has not led to the precrisis economic level of those countries affected. Nonetheless, they are saying that there is a revival in the economy. But, as people ask in such cases, what about the working people? This mild revival of the economy has been achieved by making harsh economies and cuts in social expenditure. Thatcherism and other European versions of Reaganomics basically boil down to one thing: every possible support for private companies and capital, and every possible restriction on social spending; the creation of the most favorable possible political, financial, tax, and legal conditions for entrepreneurs, and limitations on all the rights and freedoms of the working people. Social programs in the Common Market countries have been not only frozen or limited, but very often simply eliminated. And what has been the result? According to official Western figures, there are more than 13 million unemployed in the Common Market countries, or more than 12 percent of the total population able to work. I would like to stress that an economic revival is in progress, but nevertheless, over the past 12 months unemployment has grown by 3.6 percent. That's official, but as you know, very often the official figures do not include the people who have become unemployed without ever working a day in their lives -- school-leavers and graduates from some high educational establishments: nor do they include people who have fallen into despair and don't even register at the job centers, and whole categories of others. Various sources, both U.S. and European, suggest that the official unemployment figures should be increased by 50 percent or sometimes even 100 percent. However, we won't go into the mathematics of it now: the figure of 13 million is quite sufficient to show how difficult things now are for the working class of the population in the Common Market.

[Zholkver] I would specially note, Rudolf Georgiyevich -- you mentioned it, but it seems to me it is worthy being specially noted -- unemployment among young people, including young people who have even got an education, or even those with a higher education. In the FRG, according to official data, there are now 60,000 unemployed teachers, people who graduated from universities. DER SPIEGEL has just published a whole series of articles especially about unemployment among young people with higher education.

[Kolchanov] I returned from Denmark 3 weeks ago. In Denmark, out of 5 million citizens, about 300,000 are unemployed, among them, 25 percent are in fact unemployed young people under 25 years old, and these people are exactly who you are talking about, in particular, the graduates of higher educational establishments. Some of the graduates are going to be deliberately sacrificed before they start; for example, from the start, one-third of teachers are doomed to failure in finding a job.

[Zholkver] those people who did not receive higher education or even specialized secondary education are in a particularly difficult situation. This is a vicious circle: young people are not being employed because they do not have vocational training. On the other hand, in Common Market countries, and I have worked in the FRG for several years, where in particular, the system of vocational training is not a state one, there are a certain number of places for trainees to obtain vocational education at private firms; but how can they take trainees if there is mass unemployment among experienced workers? It means that the number of employees as well as the number of training places is being reduced. And this is how the vicious circle emerges.

On one hand, it is impossible to get a job without professional qualifications, and on the other, it is impossible to obtain professional qualifications because of mass unemployment.

[Kolchanov] But the vicious circle by the way, Aleksandr Vladimirovich, also includes some other facts. In Denmark, a person cannot get unemployment benefits if he is not a trade union member, and he cannot become a trade union member if he is not employed anywhere. This is also a vicious circle. Another vicious circle is that a graduate, or rather a student, while studying in a college, must of necessity take a bank loan if there is not substantial support from home, and the terrible interest grows, literally up to half million crowns, and often he has to pay this money back almost up to retirement.

[Zholkver] If he can afford it!

[Kolchanov] Yes, if he can afford it; so another vicious circle occurs. So, the chain of social inequality and social oppression is being woven out of these vicious circles.

Common Market Versus U.S.

[Beglov] It seems to me we must see the reasons that bring people to this vicious circle, not only in the context of individual countries, but also in that circle of contradictions in which the Common Market countries are muddled in, and then in those problems that arise in relations with such competitors as the United States. The Common Market countries still cannot solve the serious problems of relations with the United States, which behaves unceremoniously, and I would say here the word selfishly is quite applicable, when it comes to establishing discriminatory principles in trade -- so-called protectionism, or attempts to put up barriers against West European industrial products. This, of course, leads to the decline of industries such as metallurgy, especially the steel industry, when with each passing year the United States imposes ever greater restrictions on imports of this type of product from Western Europe. In contrast to the CEMA, where the principle of equality prevails and where those countries still at a lower level of economic development are leveled up, here there operates the principle inherent in the capitalist economy not only of fierce competition but, I would say, of pushing even further into a dead-end those areas -- individual countries or areas of individual countries -- already in a disastrous situation. Take Great Britain, for example. The whole world is talking about the Brussels football carnage, as it is described. It's not just a question of the moral and ethical aspect, but behind the hooliganism, behind this outbreak of violence among young people lies the simple fact that, in Great Britain, as a result of the ailing steel industry, shipbuilding industry, and traditional industries that are being crushed by competitors from both sides, from beyond the English Channel and beyond the Atlantic, entire regions have turned into what they call industrial wastelands. I happen to have been to Liverpool and it is a pitiful sight. The city used to be a symbol of Britain's industrial might, and now the docks stand empty, the factories are closed, the steel smelting furnaces are no longer in operation, and young people with nothing to do easily fall victim to all sorts of neo-Nazi and nationalist ringleaders, to the cult of violence, because there is nowhere for them to go, nothing for them to apply their energy to -- no prospects, no future.

[Kolchanov] Spartak Ivanovich, there is a reliable barometer that indicates the deterioration of the position of the working people, which is the exacerbation of class confrontation and those phenomena you have just mentioned, and also the growth of the strike movement. The strike movement shows how profound and acute social contradictions within the Common Market have become. Think of the British miners' strike -- a 1 year-long heroic struggle with casualties, people killed, arrested, and thousands injured. Or to come back to Denmark once more -- out of a population of only 5 million, 300,000 took part in the strike, and this is again unparalleled in history.

As we're on the subject of the Common Market, let's look at the other member countries. Strikes broke out in the automobile construction and printing industries in the FRG and then spread to a number of associated industries, electronics, engineering as a whole, and ferrous metallurgy. The FRG's biggest ever protest meeting was attended by more than 250,000 people. Against this background, the anti-trade union offensive is growing more intense and more vicious. For example, 5,000 CGT activists, -- the French General Labor Confederation, an important trade union organization -- have recently been persecuted in some way or other. Over the last 6 months, 27 people have been sacked for trade union work in one small department. Class confrontation is becoming more intense and this is reflected, or expressed, in fierce clashes between capital and workers.

Conflict Over SDI

[Zholkver] Yes, there is a very interesting example of this, again in France. You, of course, know, Rudolf Georgiyevich, that besides the CGT, there is the CFDT [French Democratic Confederation of Labor], a reformist trade union which, until recently, supported government policies. At the CFDT congress, which has just been held in Bordeaux, Edmond Maire, the general secretary, stated that the government's economic and social policy has been a flop, that promises have not been kept, and that a mood of dissatisfaction and alarm held sway among the working people. The fact that this is being said by a figure such as Edmond Maire is further proof of the intensity of the class and social struggle. But I think that when we talk about acute contradictions and clashes between the Common Market and the United States, or within the Common Market itself, particularly in connection with the entry of Spain and Portugal, which aggravates the contradictions even further, we should note the common denominator -- the interests of the major West European and U.S. monopolies, both in the social sphere, that is, in the general struggle against the working people, and, I would say, in the military-political sphere. They are united by the common desire for record profits, mainly from military production and, not least, from the production of especially expensive types of weapons for the military-space business.

[Kolchanov] Yes, naturally. Let's take the position of Great Britain, for example, as regards the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, or rather, the plans for producing space strike weapons, which now form one of the major issues in U.S.-West European relations. Great Britain, as we can see, is hesitating. On the one hand, common sense indicates that they should say no to this new stage in the arms race, and there are sober-minded people in Britain who say as much, even in the prime minister's political entourage; and on the other hand, many of Britain's industrialists and monopolists are concerned not to miss out on the benefits. And, I would say, financiers looking for a good investment are very, very actively trying to urge the British Government into taking the very imprudent step of participating in the strategic initiative. We can see the same happening in other countries, such as the FRG.

[Zholkver] Just last week, a large group of so-called West German experts, consisting of government representatives and representatives from major industrial and research firms, visited Washington for talks on precisely this subject, possible participation in space weapons production. As for Great Britain, Spartak Ivanovich, just the other day, that country was host to General Abrahamson, the head of the U.S. military space program, who had talks with Heseltine, head of the British war department [as heard], about Britain's participation in producing, for example, so-called electromagnetic guns for use in space. So here the monopolies' common interest in getting a nice fat piece of the cake and hefty profits from space weapon production is quite obvious.

[Kolchanov] Both the community of interests and, at the same time, the selfishness of their interests, are evident.

Each is trying to grab his own piece of the cake, but at the same time, the United States, while wishing to harness the technological and industrial potential of the other capitalist countries to the development work, has not the slightest intention of sharing the cake.

SALT II Treaty

[Zholkver] Yes, that's quite correct. The figures show that U.S. monopolies will get the biggest share of the cake. This is what I read in DER SPIEGEL: the Boeing aviation concern has already received military space orders from the Pentagon worth $364 million; Lockheed, another aviation concern, $240 million; Douglas, again an aviation concern, $237 million. The interests of these monopolies are supported by Pentagon chief Weinberger, who is so persistently campaigning for preparation for "star wars." At the same time, it is quite impossible not to notice that by doing this, the United States and the Washington administration are violating a whole range of international statutes, treaties, and agreements, including some signed with the USSR, such as the Soviet-American ABM Treaty. We happen right now to be on the eve of the 6th anniversary of the signing of the SALT II treaty in Vienna, and although it was not ratified by the United States, they have stated that they will adhere to the treaty's provisions. Is that not so, Spartak Ivanovich?

[Beglov] At that time, we indeed had occasion, Aleksandr Vladimirovich, to be in Vienna together 6 years ago, and how many good and true words were said on the importance of that treaty, including from the U.S. side. But, I also recall that 10 weeks later, I was in the United States for another reason and discovered what a campaign had arisen there to discredit the treaty, to discredit President Carter, who had appended his signature. This treaty ran counter to the plans, those schemes of seizing upon new weapons systems, of arriving at the level of military superiority, which the right wing, so-called ultraconservative circles in the United States, had already come up with.

[Kolchanov] Spartak Aleksandrovich, if at that time they had declared the treaty to be anathema, then a few years later, especially under the present U.S. Administration, they have already moved from anathema to direct violation of the treaty, violating at one and the same time both the 1972 ABM Treaty and the protocol that was added to it, which is full of extremely important and substantial content. Well, the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles is a direct violation of SALT II.

[Beglov] Of the spirit of SALT II.

[Kolchanov] The production of long-range cruise missiles is a direct violation.

[Beglov] This is a violation of the protocol that provided for the continuity of the process; that is, the conclusion of new agreements which would impose a ban on long-range missiles and exclude them from the arsenals. This dual game is connected with a subterfuge of the present administration, which consists of attempting to move all the blame from the guilty on to the innocent, on to the Soviet Union -- in other words, while continuing to violate, to accuse the Soviet Union, or while accusing the Soviet Union, to continue violating. This was the scheme of President Reagan when he made the gesture on Monday [10 June] to the effect that the United States will continue to adhere to, and even accordingly take certain measures in the framework of the limits of that treaty; what is in mind is that in the fall the United States will launch the new submarine Alaska of the Trident system, a submarine armed with 24 missiles, each of them containing 10 warheads, and each nuclear warhead four times as powerful as the Hiroshima one.

That is why all this engendered such a firm rebuff from the Soviet Union when it was stated that our country would not permit the United States to dictate which obligations would be observed and which not. The Soviet Union will draw the appropriate conclusions from all this dictated by the interests of its security and the security of its allies.

[Zholkver] At the same time, it seems to me that it should also be noted that the more sober-minded circles in the United States itself and in Western Europe are realizing what a dangerous road the United States is embarking on this case. And it is interesting -- I saw an article in THE NEW YORK TIMES noting that three of the five members of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, including the chief himself, expressed themselves in favor of the President's not fully renouncing the SALT-II treaty concluded with the Soviet Union since the United States may lose more than it gains. It is hinted fairly transparently in the article that the Soviet Union may take corresponding counter measures, and there is no guarantee at all that such a violation of the SALT II treaty would enhance the security of the United States. Incidentally, it is surely interesting that the U.S. Senate voted to call on President Reagan to continue observing the provisions of the SALT II treaty by 90 votes to 5.

[Kolchanov] This is as far as intra-American relations are concerned, but you know that quite recently the so-called spring meetings of the leading NATO organs were held, and in Portugal there was a session of the foreign ministers of the NATO member-countries. What is interesting is that all the European participant countries of the bloc came out in favor of Washington's observing the previously concluded treaty for the same reasons that we mentioned just now. Words fail me in describing the irresponsible attitude to treaties concluded by the United States, which has now reached such heights that it is indeed causing indignation even among its closest allies. I shall explain my thought by returning to the treaty on antimissile defence of 1972. I remind you of Article 5 of that treaty, which expressly forbids the creation, testing, and deployment of systems and components of antimissile defense that are space-based.

[Beglov] There is another article, Article 13, of the treaty, which says that both sides undertake to agree on measures between them that would lead to strengthening the basis of the treaty.

Gandhi Visit to U.S.

[Zholkver] It must be said that this strengthening of security is also being demanded by the representatives of other countries. At present, as you know, Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India is a guest in the United States. He had a meeting with a group of U.S. scientists, at which he sharply condemned the plans to create space weapons in the United States, precisely because, as he put it, they move the world toward the brink of the abyss of nuclear war. Incidentally, he resolutely rejected as groundless the assertions that this program has a defensive nature, declaring straight out that it is a weapons development.

[Beglov] Yes, Rajiv Gandhi's current visit to the United States draws a comparison, as it were, between the two courses of world policy. We know that Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi recently visited the Soviet Union and what was discussed. It was about ensuring the strengthening and developing of all possibilities and initiatives that would lead to the consolidation of peace and to preventing the arms race. Rajiv Gandhi represents the group of states -- very influential, six states from five continents -- which have already twice formulated their common platform and have called on the nuclear powers for an immediate cessation to the arms race, for an immediate start to the reduction and elimination of nuclear arsenals.

[Zholkver] You mean the Delhi Declaration?

[Beglov] The Delhi Declaration of January this year. But, after all, only the Soviet Union replied positively and encouragingly, I would say, to this declaration, and expressed its readiness to go along the road designated in the declaration. In receiving Rajiv Gandhi in Washington, the U.S. Administration cannot even boast of a simple, so to speak, expression of understanding of the essence, of the spirit and importance of this declaration. Finally there is the question of U.S. interference in India's internal affairs and its encirclement of India, the use of Pakistan as a springboard, the slighting of the Indian proposal to transform the Indian Ocean into a peace zone.

[Zholkver] It must be said that Rajiv Gandhi himself, speaking in the United States, stressed that he had recently been to Moscow, and that the Soviet leadership had adopted a very positive attitude toward the Delhi Declaration. The Soviet Union, said Rajiv Gandhi word for word, speaking in the United States, is displaying the readiness to disarm. As we see, this cannot be said of the United States, and I think that in concluding our conversation, it ought to be emphasized that precisely the material of the conference just held at the CPSU Central Committee on problems of accelerating scientific and technical progress stresses yet again that the Soviet Union is engaged in peaceful, creative labor. We have a lot ahead of us to do -- not easy, but widescale, innovative tasks -- and it is only po-sible to solve this whole complex of tasks facing our people and our party, of course, in conditions of peace. The struggle to maintain and consolidate peace, to prevent the danger of nuclear war, is still the main thing in the foreign policy of our party and our country. Here we shall end our conversation at the roundtable. Thank you, comrades, for taking part in it. Thank you, comrade listeners, for your attention. All the best.

ZAGLADIN WRITES ON SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY

PM140851 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 23, Jun 85 pp 5-8

[Article by Vadim Zagladin: "Policy of Peace and Progress']

[Text] The entire country is looking forward to the 27th Congress of our Leninist Party.

It is only natural that people in all parts of the Soviet Union should be weighing, in public and in private, the past record and giving thought to the prospects ahead. What has been accomplished in the years since the 26th Congress of the CPSU? What has not been achieved in full? On what should efforts be concentrated in the future?

They are giving thought to both domestic and foreign policies without divorcing the one from the other. This too is logical, for the home and foreign policies of any country are interrelated and cannot be separated. Our home policy, our accomplishments in economic, political, social and cultural development create the essential groundwork for our foreign policy of peace, while our foreign policy is concentrated on the creation of the most favourable -- and this primarily means peaceful -- conditions for perfecting developed socialism, for building communism.

The conclusions from the present discussions will of course be drawn by the coming congress. But it can be confidently said already now that we have much to be proud of.

The internal affairs of our country are a subject in itself worthy of closer examination. But even if we confine ourselves to looking at them from the foreign policy angle it can be seen that the country has significantly gained in strength, become richer and mightier, in the years since the 26th Congress.

And, accordingly, the foundation on which the Party's political line in world affairs rests has become stronger and firmer than ever.

This is clearly evidenced if only by the fact that in these years our country, together with our allies, has succeeded in foiling the plans hatched on the other side of the Atlantic to upset the existing military strategic parity, to alter the world balance in favour of imperialism and to gain superiority over socialism. This is a weighty, encouraging fact. And we may rest confident that in the future too no one will be able to place the Soviet Union and its allies in the position of the weaker side, to undermine the strength of socialism.

Our socialist economy is the solid foundation of the military strength of socialism. We are in a position adequately to reply to any threat on land, at sea, under water, or in outer space. Reply, I repeat. For the Soviet state is concerned only with legitimate, essential defence of its security and interests. The striving for domination, superiority of strength, and diktat are alien to the very nature of our socialist country.

Let us take a look at the balance sheet of our foreign policy in recent years.

It should above all be borne in mind that the years since the 26th CPSU Congress have been anxious, tense years for the whole world. The struggle between the two diametrically opposed policies in the world arena is of course no new development. This struggle has been going on incessantly for nearly 70 years, ever since the Great October Socialist Revolution. But in recent years the confrontation between the policy of peace and the policy of war has become particularly acute and tense. It is against this political background that our foreign policy initiatives have been elaborated and put forward.

The basic features and areas of this confrontation are well known and hardly need be repeated. But for all that, it might be in place to stress that the years since the 26th Congress have been marked both by the continuation of the earlier trends and by the emergence of new aspects reflecting the specific features and determining the sharpening of the struggle now going on in the world political arena.

That the arms race has long since become, through the fault of imperialism and to the great distress of all peoples, a feature of our time is self-evident. But it is plain to see that latterly it too has acquired new features. Above all this applies to its scale: never before has so much been spent on war preparations. In this the United States certainly holds pride of place, channelling hundreds of billions of dollars annually to the development and manufacture of mass destruction weapons and the training and deployment of armed forces.

And it is not only a matter of the scale of the arms drive. Far more alarming is the development in the U.S. of qualitatively new weapons capable of creating a new and truly global threat to the whole of humanity. I have in mind above all the "star wars" plans for carrying the arms race to outer space.

That imperialism, and specifically the NATO countries, have long been setting up more and more military bases along the periphery of the socialist world and deploying at these bases more and more sophisticated weaponry likewise is not news. But here too new developments have taken place in the past four years or so. In Europe the deployment of the new U.S. nuclear missiles began. Although these are classified as medium-range missiles, actually they are of strategic significance, augmenting as they do the United States' strategic first-strike arsenal. At the same time, in the Far East, around Japan and on its territory, new military installations are springing up, providing base facilities for nuclear-capable aircraft and navy ships armed with nuclear weapons.

That NATO headquarters are incessantly working to perfect their strategic concepts and plans has long been common knowledge. However, the latest plans calling for the development and deployment of more sophisticated types of conventional weapons (which approximate more and more to mass destruction weapons) and envisaging immediate strikes in depth at the socialist countries in the event of any conflict unquestionably introduce a new element in the strategic situation on our continent, and a highly dangerous element at that.

That crude pressuring of other countries and "export of counterrevolution" are standard expedients employed by imperialism has long been a well-known fact. The entire history of imperialism, primarily of U.S. imperialism, is a record of naked aggression and ruthless trampling of the rights of entire peoples. But here too new elements have emerged in recent years. If formerly the U.S. camouflaged its acts of aggression with seemingly decorous verbiage, now it goes about it with brazen arrogance. More, such actions are not merely considered justified, they are propounded and eulogized as nothing short of exemplary defence of democracy, as a model of morality in world affairs. The savage occupation of Grenada, the undeclared war against Afghanistan which is steadily gaining in scope, and the unprecedented pressure of every kind exerted on sovereign free Nicaragua are all ugly hallmarks of recent years.

Lastly, a glaring new element of the present period is that all these criminal actions that push humanity ever closer to the brink of a war of annihilation have been elevated to the eminence of official state policy. In a shameless attempt to justify these actions "theoretically," Messianic sermons are preached about a "holy war," a "crusade" against socialism and all democratic and progressive forces. The imperialist quarters, and primarily those of the United States, have indeed set out, as was rightly pointed out at the 26th Congress of the CPSU, "to achieve the unachievable -- to set up a barrier to progressive changes in the world, and to again become the arbiters of the peoples' destinies."

Why have things taken this course? Why is it that the world departed from the detente of the mid-seventies, on which the peoples placed such great hopes, to be plunged into confrontation? This question is being asked everywhere. The first to give a straightforward, honest answer to it were the communists. Today more and more political forces are coming to share their opinion. That opinion was voiced also at the 26th Congress of the CPSU, which, noting the deepening of the crisis of capitalism, the growth of economic, political and social difficulties in the capitalist world, pointed out that these difficulties were influencing the policy of imperialism, foreign policy included, and giving rise to adventurism, a readiness to ride roughshod over mankind's vital interests in pursuance of its own narrow, selfish ends.

The most aggressive imperialist quarters believe that the way to strengthening their positions lies through confrontation with socialism, through "rolling it back" and, better still, destroying it.

This is an unwise, unrealistic and shortsighted approach. It is already perfectly clear that, by pushing the world farther and farther along the road of confrontation, imperialism is not overcoming its difficulties but rather aggravating them. If an attempt were made to resolve the dispute between the two opposing systems by force of arms it would not save imperialism but would destroy all humanity. The road of confrontation chosen by the Western aggressive quarters is a road to nowhere.

The imperialist policy of confrontation, arms buildup and tension-building of course has not made it easier for our foreign policy to resolve the tasks facing it. It is understandable that in these circumstances persevering continuation of the struggle to remove the threat of war, to preserve and deepen detente and to promote mutually advantageous cooperation with most countries of the world should have become our prime task, as was declared at the 26th Congress.

"Our struggle to strengthen peace and deepen detente," the congress noted, "is above all designed to secure the requisite external conditions for the Soviet people to carry out their constructive tasks. Thereby we are also solving a problem of a truly global nature. For at present nothing is more essential and more important for any nation than to preserve peace and ensure the paramount right of every human being -- the right to life."

Throughout the years since then our foreign policy has worked for the attainment of this momentous objective with undiminishing energy, dedication and perseverence.

It is perhaps precisely in this period that the consistency and continuity of the Soviet Union's foreign policy course has been manifested with particular force and clarity. It so happened that in the period since the last congress three general secretaries of the CPSU -- Leonid Brezhnev, Yuriy Andropov and Konstantin Chernenko -- passed away. How much speculation there was in the West in expectation of sensational changes and shifts in our policy! But all this wishful thinking collapsed like a house of cards. The CPSU has conclusively demonstrated that its policy, a policy that originated with Lenin, with the Great October Revolution, is a truly consistent and unfailingly peaceful policy.

"The Soviet Union declares again and again that it will firmly follow the Leninist policy of peace and peaceful coexistence which is determined by our social system, our morality and our world outlook," CPSU Central Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev stressed at the April 1985 plenary meeting of the Party's Central Committee. "We stand for stable, correct, if you wish civilized interstate relations based on genuine respect for the norms of international law. But it should be made quite clear that only if imperialism abandons its attempts to resolve the historical dispute between the two social systems by military means will it be possible to direct international relations onto the lines of normal cooperation."

It will be recalled that the 26th Congress of the CPSU put forward a peace programme for the eighties. That programme contained a number of important proposals relating to key world political issues, above all to the termination of the arms race, primarily the nuclear buildup. They envisaged radical measures to remove the existing seats of war and tension. The congress confirmed the Soviet Union's readiness to pursue a course of peaceful coexistence and mutually beneficial cooperation with all countries of the world. "Not war preparations that doom the peoples to a senseless squandering of their material and spiritual wealth, but consolidation of peace -- that is the clue to the future." This was the keynote of the decisions of the 26th Congress.

Had the initiatives put forward by the congress met with a positive response on the part of the West, the world today would be quite different from what it is. It could truly be a world at peace. But this did not happen, the West, as we have said above, again opted for confrontation.

When this happened, many the world over lost their bearings, unable at once to see whence the threat to peace emanated, who had torpedoed detente. But the Soviet Union and its friends, the countries of the socialist community, did not lose their heads, did not lose their capacity for rational thinking. Firmly rebuffing the aggressive actions of imperialist policy and not allowing themselves to be provoked, they steadfastly pursued their policy of combatting the war threat.

Of course, we took the necessary steps to safeguard our security, as has been mentioned above. But, and this is most important, to every move made by the West on the road of confrontation we replied with constructive initiatives aimed at ending the confrontation.

And to every new step in the arms buildup we replied with concrete proposals aimed at the reduction of armaments, at disarmament.

In the more than four years since the 26th Congress of the CPSU -- from February 23 1981, to this May -- our country has advanced more than 80 proposals on key world political issues. Among them are a number of initiatives relating to the prevention of the militarization of outer space and to the use of space exclusively for peaceful purposes, concrete proposals for reducing nuclear arsenals, including a proposal to rid Europe completely of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical, and a proposal that chemical weapons be banned.

We have voiced readiness to help create nuclear-free zones in Northern Europe and in the Balkans, and urged that the Mediterranean be made a zone of stable peace and cooperation. We have proposed concrete measures to reduce armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. There also have been Soviet initiatives aimed at the settlement of existing local conflicts.

And, needless to say, the CPSU, the Soviet state and the Soviet people have all these years consistently defended the interests of countries subjected to pressure and oppression by imperialism. In so doing, we have not sought one-sided gains for ourselves, neither material nor other advantages. We have acted thus prompted by our revolutionary conscience and our socialist convictions. We have acted thus taking into account the norms of international law, in conformity with which every people is entitled to order its own destiny, to choose one or another form of government, the social system it wants. The Soviet Union firmly stands for strict observance of this lawful right of the peoples. In this we see one of the pillars of lasting peace, a decisive guarantee of peaceful coexistence.

The Soviet Union has steadfastly pursued this policy together with the other socialist countries. Our party regards the all-round development of our relations with the fraternal countries and the deepening of cooperation within the socialist community as a cardinal prerequisite of the successful building of the new society in the socialist part of the world, as well as of the strengthening of international security. Headway has been made in recent years in relations among all the socialist countries. Progress is gradually being made in the important matter of normalizing Soviet-Chinese relations.

The socialist countries' defensive alliance, the Warsaw Treaty Organization, the term of which was recently prolonged by mutual agreement, has demonstrated its worth on the world arena. What an abundance of meaningful profound ideas in favor of peace can be found in the documents of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee. They are all timely, even those that were advanced many months and even several years ago. Today too they offer a programme for the return of the world community to normal, civilized, peaceful intercourse.

The firm resolve of the Warsaw Treaty states to prevent the world from being plunged into the disaster of war was once again convincingly confirmed at the meeting of their top leaders held in April in Warsaw. "In the present international situation," the communique on the meeting stated, "it is more necessary than ever to unite the efforts of all peoples and states, of all peace forces irrespective of their political orientation, to stop the world from drifting towards a nuclear catastrophe."

The Western powers, however, have as a rule turned down the socialist countries' proposals or, totally discarding diplomatic decorum, not even bothered to reply to them. But does this mean that our initiatives have gone to waste? Certainly not.

"It is a noteworthy fact of recent years that the more stubbornly the West has refused to accept or even to examine the socialist countries' initiatives and proposals, the greater the interest evinced in them by the peoples, countries outside the orbit of imperialist alliances, and even the governments of some countries allied with the United States.

There have been four sessions of the U.N. General Assembly since the 26th Congress of the CPSU. The proposals submitted to these sessions by the Soviet Union and its allies, either by themselves or together with other countries, have invariably been supported by the overwhelming majority of the world community. The West, and primarily the U.S., has found itself in unenviable isolation.

Hence, incidentally, Washington's unceasing attacks on the United Nations, which it accuses of being ineffective. That accusation is patently false. By adopting decision after decision in favor of peace and disarmament, against the militarization of outer space, for the promotion of peaceful cooperation among the nations in spheres such as aid to newly free countries, protection of the environment and expansion of genuinely free flow of information among all peoples, the United Nations and its agencies are performing an exceptionally important and useful function.

Some Western observers at times ask: how have the Russians managed to "manipulate" the U.N. so that it votes for their proposals?

There has never been any such "manipulation." The explanation is simple: Soviet foreign policy, the policy of socialism in general, takes into account the genuine interests of all mankind, and has always done so. Not a single one of our foreign policy initiatives is detrimental to the sovereignty, security interests or freedom of any country, of any people.

Or put it this way: all our initiatives consistently take into account not only our own convictions but also the views and proposals on issues of peace and security opinion, by other countries, even if they belong to a social system different from our own.

Our foreign policy is, so to speak, the synthesis of the peaceful aspirations of all humanity. It is truly a policy of peace and progress. Hence the wide support it enjoys, not only in the United Nations, but everywhere in the world. This is the source of its strength and influence.

Lately, since the beginning of this year, along with the continued growth of negative tendencies, some encouraging developments have appeared. New negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States on space and nuclear armaments have begun. They are difficult negotiations and so far do not give cause for great hopes, but they are going on, and our diplomacy will do everything possible to ensure their success.

New ideas and proposals have been advanced in the Stockholm and Vienna talks which, it is believed also by many in the West, could make for constructive headway. Needless to say, these ideas and proposals come primarily from the U.S.S.R. and other socialist countries.

Important too is it that cooperation between the U.S.S.R. and the other countries that have thrown off the colonial yoke, on the other, is being expanded and deepened. A good example of this is the constructive cooperation between the Soviet Union and India. The initiatives of the newly independent countries, their growing activity, are a noteworthy and promising element of the world situation.

Fruitful contacts, including those at the highest level, are developing between the Soviet Union and most West European countries as well as Japan.

In the course of these contacts -- as, for instance, during the recent talks in Moscow with the Italian Prime Minister -- both sides speak of the need to end the confrontation and return to detente.

Although Soviet-American relations have not yet emerged from the ice age, the past several months have witnessed significant, if so far not productive of substantial results, bilateral business contacts between the two countries.

New impulse has been given to the anti-war movement, which is displaying ever greater determination in the struggle not only to put an end to the arms race on earth, but also to prevent the militarization of outer space.

Cooperation between different political and social forces in the fight against the war danger is acquiring a new depth and ever wider dimensions. The latest instance of this was the fruitful meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Willy Brandt, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany and of the Socialist International.

In a word, even if the horizon is still darkened by thunderheads, there are no grounds for pessimism.

Further deterioration of the situation is by no means inevitable. That this is so is to a great extent to the credit primarily of socialism and, of course, Soviet foreign policy.

Unlike many Western politicians, we take a realistic view of developments. Yes, there still are in the world two diametrically opposed social systems. Their philosophies and their views radically differ. But this need not necessarily lead to confrontation. The contradictions existing in the world cannot be resolved by either confrontation or war. There is no rational alternative to peaceful coexistence, to constructive relations between countries, especially in our nuclear age. Such is the reality. And Soviet foreign policy takes this reality fully into-account.

As it approaches its 27th Congress, our party firmly steers a course aimed at bringing about a turn in world affairs, a return to detente.

"Return," incidentally, is not quite the word. For what is in question is not a matter of returning to the past, but of moving forward, to a new and deeper detente that would evolve into stable, durable peaceful coexistence and competition between states with different social systems.

We are fully prepared for this. We want it. If anyone fears peaceful competition with socialism, that is their business. Socialism is certain of its vitality, its prospects and its advantages.

It is these advantages that have ensured the successful building of socialism in the U.S.S.R. for seven decades now. They have made it possible to preserve peace for 40 years after World War II. And it is these advantages that will make it possible to preserve and strengthen peace in the future.

Of this we are convinced.

MOSCOW NOTES 'GLOBAL SHIELD-85,' OTHER MANEUVERS

LD161308 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 16 Jun 85

[Text] The United States and its allies have been demonstrating a military force in numerous regions.

A large-scale exercise codenamed "Global Shield-85" is under way. Taking part are strategic air and missile forces, U.S. Navy and Marines. In the North and Baltic Seas, the West German Navy is conducting a major exercise involving 50 warships and aircraft. Another exercise codenamed ("Central Enterprise") has just ended in Central Europe. It involved the Air Forces of West Germany, Belgium, Britain, Canada, the Netherlands, and the United States. In South Korea, special units of the 7th U.S. Infantry Division have carried out their first maneuvers. The division is part of the interventionist Rapid Deployment Force.

IAEA LAUDS USSR AGREEMENT ON NUCLEAR MONITORING

LD142152 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1930 GMT 14 Jun 85

[Text] The latest session of the IAEA Board of Governors ended in Vienna today. Delegations from 35 countries, including the USSR, that are members of the board took part in the session. They reviewed issues relating to the agency's monitoring activity to ensure the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons as well as the program for the organization's work in the immediate future. It was announced at the session that the agreement between the USSR and the IAEA placing a part of the peaceful nuclear activity in the Soviet Union under the agency's control came into force on 10 June of this year. The members of the board of governors highly appraised the significance of the Soviet Union's voluntary agreement for international inspections to be carried out in a number of its nuclear power plants and research reactors.

INTERNATIONAL TU COMMITTEE DISCUSSES DISARMAMENT

LD151723 Moscow TASS in English 1621 GMT 15 Jun 85

[Text] Geneva June 15 TASS -- An open meeting of the International Trade Union Committee on Peace and Disarmament (Dublin Committee) took place here today under the keynote "Trade Unions: Responsibility for the Preservation of Life on Earth." The meeting was attended by representatives of about 30 countries and 6 international organizations. The discussion confirmed anew far-ranging worry over the dangerous world situation caused primarily by the arms race and by the threat of its being spread into outer space. Speakers from European, Asian and African countries stressed that the struggle for peace and disarmament was inseparable from the struggle for the vital interests of the working people and for social progress. The trade unions already are one of the motive forces of the anti-war movement but it is necessary to achieve full unity of the actions of all the working people to prevent deadly nuclear war.

TASS NOTES U.S. REACTION TO TWA 847 HIJACKING

LD170944 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0907 GMT 17 Jun 85

[Text] Beirut, 17 Jun (TASS) -- A group of armed men are still holding an American Boeing-727 airliner in Beirut airport with about 30 U.S. citizens on board. The group has announced that it intends to hold the aircraft until their demand for the release of around 700 Shi'ite Muslims from Israeli jails is met. Several passengers were disembarked at the airport and driven off to an unknown destination.

Shi'ite armed detachments have been deployed around the aircraft carrying the American hostages. It is reported that Nabih Birri, the leader of the Shi'ite Amal movement in Lebanon, is holding talks with the ambassadors of the United States, Great Britain, France, and Spain, and representatives of the International Red Cross.

The U.S. Government has sent a special group of American "commandos" to the port of Larnaca in Cyprus. It is also reported that the U.S. Navy aircraft carrier Nimitz has been ordered to patrol the central Mediterranean, and the missile destroyer Kidd to leave the Israeli port of Haifa.

White House circles think that the hijacking of the American aircraft with U.S. citizens may lead to an exacerbation of the situation in the region, and also serve as gounds for possible U.S. military intervention.

USSR EXPELS U.S. DIPLOMAT FOR ESPIONAGE ACTIVITY

PM171315 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Jun 85 Second Edition p 5

["At the USSR State Security Committee"]

[Text] Paul Stombauch, a second secretary at the United States Embassy, was detained in Moscow on June 13, 1985 in the act of conducting an espionage action. A major espionage action by United States special services against the Soviet Union was cut short.

Materials fully exposing this staff member of the United States Embassy in engaging in espionage activity incompatible with his official status were obtained in the course of the investigation. For his unlawful actions Paul Stombauch was declared a persona non grata and is being expelled from the Soviet Union.

TASS CITES GANDHI'S REMARKS TO U.S. CONGRESS

LD141537 Moscow TASS in English 1509 GMT 14 Jun 85

[Text] Washington June 14 TASS -- Addressing a joint sitting of the U.S. Congress on Thursday, the Prime Minister of India Rajiv Gandhi, now on an official visit in the United States, expressed serious concern over the fact that the arms race is not terminated, but, moreover, gains in its ominous scopes. He said, in part, that India was worried about the arms race acquiring new dimensions. As a result, it becomes more and more difficult to achieve the ultimate goal -- disarmament. This is the reason why we have serious reservations with respect to the militarization of the outer space, said Rajiv Gandhi. This statement was seen by observers as direct reference to the Pentagon plans to create a large-scale anti-missile defense system with space-based elements.

Both in his address to Congress and speech at a banquet given in his honour in the White House, Rajiv Gandhi particularly stressed India's sincere striving to ensure peace on earth and put a stop to the arms race. Recalling the New Delhi Declaration of the heads of state and government of the six states, the prime minister said that India, the Non-Alignment Movement and all nations would welcome and support any positive step in the direction of disarmament. In this connection, the Indian head of state expressed the hope that the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms, which are currently held in Geneva, would produce positive results.

Expressing worry about peace which is too fragile today, Rajiv Gandhi underscored that India was alarmed with the moves to set up military bases in various parts of the world. We are directly affected by the militarization of the Indian Ocean and supplies of more and more sophisticated weaponry to neighboring countries, he said. The ASSOCIATED PRESS points out that the prime minister obviously had in view U.S. advanced arms sales to Pakistan, which by far exceed Islamabad's defense requirements. For its part, India, said Rajiv Gandhi, strives for peace, goodneighbourliness and friendly cooperation in South Asia.

Touching upon the situation around Afghanistan, the Indian leader, ASSOCIATED PRESS points out, gave such an analysis of the reasons behind the existing situation that is in sharp contrast with the U.S. stand. Rajiv Gandhi said that India opposed outside pressure. What is known to be implied by this is the United States' support for gangs of anti-Afghan counterrevolutionary scum, which make gangster raids on the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan from Pakistani territory.

Concern over the present state of things in international economy and trade was also expressed in the prime minister's statements. Addressing members of the U.S. Congress, where protectionist sentiments are particularly strong now, he denounced the policy of erecting new barriers in international trade, which, he said, jeopardized the welfare of millions upon millions of people in developing countries. The world economy, said Rajiv Gandhi, should develop on a mutually advantageous basis.

HOUSE VOTE FOR AID TO CONTRAS DENOUNCED

PM141348 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 85 First Edition p 5

[Vadim Listov's "Observer's Opinion" under general heading: "United States, Nicaragua: Gambling on Crude Force"]

[Text] U.S. occupation forces were already landing in the Dominican Republic to suppress the patriotic movement which had flared up there as the U.S. representative in the UN Security Council held forth about "noninterference." This earned him the scathing heckling comment: "Do not be so frank." This incident happened 20 years ago and has now recurred on a larger scale -- the "striptease" has been performed...by U.S. congressmen.

After the Senate approved the appropriation of $38 million of aid for the Nicaraguan "contras," the House of Representatives, which until recently has been rejecting the Reagan administration's demands, also voted "in favor," albeit for a slightly reduced sum. The change of heart on the part of a majority of the lawmakers was clearly influenced by the administration's unconcealed "arm-twisting" efforts in which even the President himself engaged, and also by a lying propaganda campaign launched against Sandinist Nicaragua. In other words, the U.S. Administration has succeeded, using fair means and foul, in "crushing" "recalcitrant" congressmen and pressuring them into sacrificing both their principles and public opinion.

As was to be expected, the aid to Nicaraguan "contras" is formally allocated for "humanitarian purposes" and must not be of a military nature. However, under the Senate decision it will be distributed...by the CIA, whose "humaneness" is universally known. In turn, the House of Representatives has decided not to extend the ban on the provision of military aid, which expires 30 September. Then the legal channels for giving overt military support to the "contras" will also be open. Addressing the House, Democratic Congressman Jim Wright declared that the refusal to extend the ban on military aid to the "contras" can only be interpreted as "complicity in toppling the Nicaraguan Government."

So the mask is off. The United States will continue to support the bandit formations of the Nicaraguan "freedom fighters" and the CIA, which, incidentally, has been described by the White House Deputy Press Secretary Speakes as "the best and most efficient channel for distributing aid to the 'contras,'" will be in charge of doling out the allocated millions.

Having given way to pressure from the White House, the lawmakers find themselves in the position of "the emperor in his new clothes"; the world public has once again been able to see for itself the real worth of the would-be universal patrons' assurances when it comes to freedom and democracy.

KONDRASHOV ON HOUSE VOTE, CHANGING PUBLIC OPINION

LD170019 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 16 Jun 85

[From the "International Panorama" presented by Stanislav Kondrashov]

[Text] The situation surrounding the hotspot we call Nicaragua is becoming increasingly heated every day. I have in mind the intensification of North American pressure. Here is a fact from the past week which is regrettable but, alas, at the same time indicative: On Wednesday, 12 June, the U.S. House of Representatives approved by a fairly considerable majority -- 248 votes for, 184 votes against -- the allocation of $27 million in so-called nonmilitary aid to the anti-Sandinist rebels -- that is to say, to the contras. Nonmilitary means that it cannot be made available through Pentagon or CIA channels. However, this does not change the essence of things and the character of Washington's impudent help for those who are trying to overthrow Nicaragua's legitimate government.

In April, remember, the House of Representatives voted differently, against this kind of aid. The new voting by the House, just like the recent voting in the Senate, is being viewed on Capitol Hill as a victory for the Reagan administration, and for the President personally, as he has made it his goal to bring down the Sandinist regime. How can one explain the change in attitude in Congress? By noting the unprecedented anti-Nicaraguan campaign conducted by the White House. This campaign was also anti-Soviet in character. The congressmen were accused of being spineless, and, at the same time, use was made of the fact that in April, immediately after Congress refused to give the President allocations, Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega paid a visit to Moscow. This was interpreted hysterically as an anti-American action, done for effect, and the hysteria brought the desired results in Wednesday's voting.

As a result of the unending processing of American public opinion, in which it is suggested that through Nicaragua Moscow is threatening U.S. national interests and security, an unfavorable change has been taking place in Americans' consciousness in recent weeks. Judging by opinion polls, the number of people is growing who are willing to approve different forms of U.S. interference, even taking things to the most extreme form, military intervention.

This form, which was treated previously as hypothetical, is now featured more and more often as practical, possible, and, moreover, inevitable if the revolutionary country does not bow its head before yankee imperialism which demands that the small nation arrange its affairs not as it would like but to suit Washington. In the latest issue of U.S NEWS & WORLD REPORT, CIA director William Casey put this blatantly imperialistic approach in the following terms: If, with the support of the rebels, we are unable to persuade the Sandinists to carry out a reform we will evidently have to face the question of whether or not we will have to achieve this objective by military means.

As you see, in this statement there is both blackmail and a blatant threat.

RESCINDED CLARK AMENDMENT SHOWS U.S. FOR TERRORISM

PM161826 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 85 First Edition p 5

[Igor Tarutin "Commentator's Column": "Protecting Tyranny"]

[Text] The U.S. Senate has voted to rescind the so-called "Clark Amendment" adopted on Senator Dick Clark's initiative in 1976 after the failure of South African aggression against Angola. Reflecting the public's demands, the amendment forbade the White House to give military or financial assistance to the subversive groupings attempting to overthrow the legitimate Government of Angola.

However, despite the legislative ban, the American CIA has never in fact abandoned the counterrevolutionary gangs "to the mercy of fate." Massive transfusions of dollars and arms have been passed to them via South Africa, which has taken complete charge of the terrorists. The South African newspaper THE RAND DAILY MAIL has acknowledged that maintaining the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola [UNITA] alone has cost the United States $100 million in recent years.

On their masters' instructions, armed gangs are committing outrages on Angolan soil: destroying economic installations, murdering and stealing from civilians, and taking foreign specialists hostages. Attempts are thereby being made to destabilize the situation in Angola as a whole and to step up the pressure on the country's government to force it to allow imperialist stooges access to power. It is not fortuitous that Washington has publicly declared UNITA to be an "important and legitimate factor of Angolan political life."

Interference in Angola's internal affairs is now expanding and has been placed on a state footing. The moment chosen to rescind the "Clark Amendment" is also noteworthy, coming only a short time after it became known that South African saboteurs had attempted to blow up oil refining facilities in northern Angola.

The Senate vote on the "Clark Amendment" should also be seen in a wider context. It shows that the White House is seeking to leave its hands completely free with regard to not only Angola but also Cuba, Nicaragua, Afghanistan, Cambodia, and Laos. Representatives of counterrevolutionary gangs from those countries met at a secret UNITA base in southern Angola just a few days ago to form a terrorist alliance. The U.S. President sent a greetings message to the bandit gathering in which he said: "Your aims are our aims."

There is no gainsaying that! Flagrant interference in other countries' affairs and the encouragement of bandits of all types are an integral part of the general policy of state terrorism pursued by the U.S. Administration.

KORNILOV VIEWS U.S. POLICY OF EXPORTING TERRORISM

LD162054 Moscow TASS in English 2015 GMT 16 Jun 85

["Terror Is Their Weapon" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

As has already been reported, a "conference" of bandit subversive groups, which was organised by the USA in one of areas of Africa and which was attended by the leaders of UNITA and of bandit forces operating against Nicaragua, Laos, and Afghanistan, decided to unite and coordinate their activities. "Your goals are our goals" was the message with which President Ronald Reagan of the United States addressed the gatherings of mercenaries and terrorists.

The gathering of bandit leaders under Washington's patronage in the African jungle is another evidence that subversive actions against sovereign states, aggression and terror have been made a state policy by the present ruling circles of the USA which have conceived an intention to recarve the political map of the world as they think fit. The USA and its special services have become the chief exporter of counter-revolution in the present-day world.

This is confirmed by many facts. It was precisely after the Republican administration came to power in 1980 that the counting on force, on arbitrariness and diktat were openly proclaimed the principles of the U.S. foreign-policy course while the U.S. so-called "intelligence community" entered a period of unprecedented boom. Washington lifted all restrictions imposed on the activities of special services after the scandalous exposures of the seventies and literally showers them with a golden rain of money. Incessantly voiced in the USA are calls to deliver "preemptive strikes" against so-called potential terrorists and to give greater scope to the war against those who resist the U.S. endeavours to establish U.S. diktat everywhere.

The CIA's expenditures for subversive operations have quintupled since 1981. It is no secret what kind of operations they are. They are the undeclared war unleashed by the USA against sovereign Afghanistan and attempts at turning backwards the development of events in revolutionary Nicaragua with the aid of mercenary bandits. They are the support for the racists in the south of Africa and subversive actions against peace campaigners in Western Europe, espionage, provocations, ideological and other sabotage against socialist states. U.S. special services, as is clear from the U.S. press, are now carrying out not less than fifty large-scale "undercover operations" in various regions of the world. The very fact of the convocation under U.S. aegis of a cutthroats' gathering in Africa has confirmed once again that Washington and its special services intend to continue to widely use mercenary bandits for subversive purposes.

It is known that the 39th session of the U.N. General Assembly passed a special resolution which emphasizes that the activities of mercenaries run counter to the basic principles of international law and seriously hinder the process of self-determination of peoples who struggle against colonialism, racism, apartheid and all forms of foreign domination. But the Washington crusaders do not have the slightest concern for the universally recognized international norms! In the name of ensuring the interests of U.S. monopolies, they do not disdain any measures, including interventions, assassinations and terror.

The Washington administration leaders use a good deal of words and tons of paper in an attempt to pose as adherents of a certain "international ethics" and as upholders of democracy and human rights.

The subversive provocative activities of the CIA are one of most convincing proofs of what is the real value of the rhetoric of Washington which seeks to dominate sovereign countries and peoples.

U.S. POSTPONING DECISION ON MILITARY AID TO JORDAN

LD151351 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 15 Jun 85

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] According to a NEW YORK TIMES report, President Reagan has postponed making a decision about rendering military aid to Jordan. Formal ground for this was strong opposition in the U.S. Congress on the part of pro-Israeli legislators. Official Washington, our commentator notes, openly struts with its ability to render military aid to other countries; it even imposes it on those whom it intends drawing into its military net. It is not for nothing, for example, that Washington envoys are earnestly working upon SEATO members in this respect, with a clear aim of linking them with the system of aggressive blocs knocked together by the United States.

However, Washington treats those states which assume that Washington's aid could be used in the interests of their own security in a totally different way. Jordan is a clear proof of this. It was not very long ago that Jordan's King Husayn visited the United States. According to reports published by the U.S. press he wanted Washington to deliver antiaircraft missiles and fighter jets to his country. Amman needs these facilities badly, because it intends to fortify the country's air defense. This is quite an understandable desire: Israel is right next door to Jordan, and the former's leaders make no bones of its expansionist ambitions. Jordan remembers it only too well, as Israeli carrion crows threw their weight about the sky unpunished during the 6-day War of 1967.

To make a long story short, the Jordanian authorities have got more than enough reasons to be worried. That was exactly why Amman decided to strengthen the country's military potential with American military help. However, as we can see, Washington did not meet Jordan halfway. One can hardly fail in one's search for reasons why. The fact is, Jordan is an Arabic country, one of those which the aggressive course of Israel in the Middle East is aimed against, and Tel Aviv is a faithful partner of Washington in the strategic alliance. It is the very subject constant care of the U.S. Administration, which strives not only to preserve but to multiply Israel's military superiority over the neighboring Arabic countries. It is exactly here that one of the roots of the blunt procrastination organized by the White House in terms of rendering military aid to Jordan is hidden.

There is another circumstance, however. Its nature is expressed by the fact that, at present, Washington and Tel Aviv are taking special pains to force Arab countries to enter into inequitable direct negotiations with Israel, disregarding the fact that the Zionist occupants still keep the lands captured from the neighboring states. The United States failed to obtain Jordan's accord to strike such a separatist deal with Israel. The American administration therefore decided to punish the intractable Arab country, depriving it, in fact, of its military aid.

Washington's position on this issue has once more clearly revealed that the United States has not changed its pro-Israeli policy in the Middle East.

U.S.-USSR ACTIVITIES IN SPACE CONTRASTED

LD152031 Moscow TASS in English 1816 GMT 15 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 15 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Anatoliy Krasikov writes:

On the same day the teleprinters of two news agencies, one Soviet and the other American, carried reports on space experiments, one of which is aimed at promoting science for peace and the other at developing technology for war and destruction.

On June 15 the Soviet interplanetary probe Vega-2 delivered to the atmosphere of Venus a descent module and an autonomous aerostatic probe. Scientific data sent back to Earth will help to unravel the mysteries of Venus. That experiment is an example of international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space: the descent modules of Vega-2 and its sister probe, Vega-1, which had reached Venus a few days earlier, carried new-generation instruments, some of which had been developed jointly with French specialists.

On June 15 the countdown began for the launch of the U.S. manned spaceship Discovery planned for Monday. The crew led by the American Daniel Brandestein includes, along with his compatriots, Frenchman Patrick Baudry, the stand-by of the first French cosmonaut, Jean-Louis Cretien, who made a space flight aboard a Soviet spaceship, and Prince Sultan Sulaylman al-Sa'ud of Saudi Arabia. Along with peaceful research, the Discovery will carry out a series of experiments under Reagan's "star wars" programme.

The Soviet Union has always stood for preventing the militarization of space. The memorandums of March 18 and April 30, 1957, and of March 1958, were aimed to achieve that goal. As a result of the joint efforts of the USSR and other countries, a treaty was signed in October 1967 to regulate the activities of states in studying and exploring outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies. It recorded the obligation of the parties to it not to put into orbits around the Earth any objects with nuclear weapons or any other weapons of mass destruction aboard. It was stipulated that the moon and other celestial bodies should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

The conclusion of the treaty prohibiting nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and underwater in August 1963 and of the convention banning the military or any other hostile use of the means of the modification of the environment in 1977 were major landmarks in restricting the use of space for military purposes. Lastly, the Soviet-American Treaty on Limiting Anti-Missile Defense Systems, concluded in perpetuity, became a major obstacle to the use of space for military purposes. It expressly prohibits the development, testing and deployment of systems or components of space-based anti-missile defences.

Following the letter and the spirit of the 1972 Treaty, the Soviet Union does not develop attack space weapons or anti-missile defences (the treaty allows each side to have only a limited air defence system for one region, either the capital or a base of intercontinental ballistic missiles). The USSR is carrying out research, including military research, but it is not aimed at developing attack space weapons but is related to the improvement of early warning, surveillance, communications and navigational space systems.

Unlike the Soviet Union, the United States, following President Reagan's initiative, is about to open a new area of the arms race by initiating the militarization of space. The programme of the shuttle multi-purpose spaceships is used for the purpose.

It is planned with their help, for instance, to launch military satellites, the Pentagon's orbital command posts and space weapons of a new type. Work on controlled energy weapons (laser and rail guns) [as received] is being extensively carried on. The main purpose of those weapons is to destroy space, aerial, land and sea targets and components of these weapons are planned to be tested and used in conjunction with flights of shuttle spaceships.

In this situation the Soviet Union has stated that it will not allow the strategic balance to be upset. We do not want "star wars," and we stand for the peaceful exploration of space, which was symbolized at one time by the joint Soviet-U.S. Soyuz-Apollo space venture. Regrettably, the choice between lasting peace and war depends not only on the Soviet Union.

U.S. LHX PROGRAM DESCRIBED IN KRASNAYA ZVEZDA

PM140855 [Editorial Report] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian on 5 June in its Second Edition carries on page 3 a 1,500-word article by Egnineer Yu. Boyko under the rubric "We Report at the Readers' Request" and the headline "Light Helicopters." In reply to a reader's inquiry about the foreign use of light helicopters, Boyko notes "criticism" of current U.S. helicopters and goes on to concentrate on the LHX light helicopter program for the production of advanced-technology SCAT (scout attack) and UTIL (utility) helicopters. Noting the competition between U.S. firms for the contracts, he describes in general terms the advances in flight technology proposed for the LHX -- single-pilot capability, voice-interactive instruments, computer-generated imagery in an embedded cockpit, single-stick control, fly-by-light technology, and all-composite fuselages. He concludes by noting that the Pentagon is seeking to "push ahead" with this $40 billion program to produce 5,000 machines over 10-15 years.

MANITOBA PROCLAIMS ITSELF NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE

LD130713 Moscow TASS in English 0655 GMT 13 Jun 85

[Text] Ottawa June 13 TASS -- The legislative assembly of Manitoba unanimously voted to proclaim that province in the west of Canada a zone free from nuclear weapons. Manitoba is the first Canadian province to make this initiative. The resolution was put to the vote by Manitoba Premier Howard Pawley, the leader of the New Democratic Party of the province. Pawley expressed the hope that Manitoba's decision will serve an example for other Canadian provinces and for the federal government.

USSR-PRC CONSULAR TALKS IN BEIJING 'BUSINESSLIKE'

LD141344 Moscow TASS in English 1306 GMT 14 Jun 85

[Text] Beijing June 14 TASS -- Consular delegations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Chinese People's Republic held consultations here on questions of improving and developing further consular relations between the two countries. The consultations were held in a business-like and well-wishing atmosphere.

USSR, PRC SIGN CULTURAL COOPERATION PLAN FOR 1985

LD161653 Moscow TASS in English 1210 GMT 16 Jun 85

[Text] Beijing, 16 Jun (TASS) -- A plan for cultural cooperation between the Governments of the USSR and PRC for 1985 was signed here today. The plan provides for an exchange of artistic collectives, exhibitions, concert programs, delegations of literary and arts personalities, and workers in publishing, printing, and the book trade.

The document was signed by USSR ambassador to the PRC Ilya Shcherbakov and by Lu Zhixian, PRC vice minister of culture.

PRC TOURIST GROUP CONTINUES TRIP, VISITS YEREVAN

OW152100 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1600 GMT 14 Jun 85

[Text] The Chinese tourist group led by Li Lanqing, president of the Tianjin chapters of the Chinese People's Association for Friendship With Foreign Countries and the China-USSR Friendship Association, has arrived in Yerevan, the capital of Armenia. Earlier, the group visited Moscow; Leningrad; Minsk, the capital of Belorussia, and Kiev, the capital of Ukraine.

The Armenian chapter of the Union of Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries gave a reception during which representatives from various circles in this republic in the outer Caucasus extended a warm welcome to the Chinese guests. They toured the city of Yerevan and various scenic spots. One of the world's oldest cities, Yerevan was built in 182 BC. It is also a new city almost completely rebuilt in the years of the Soviet regime. It has become one of the Soviet Union's major economic, scientific, and cultural centers. The Chinese tourist group visited the (Shivir) District, a new community with a population of 250,000 in Yerevan. The Chinese guests also toured medieval castles, historical sites, and scenic spots on the outskirts of Yerevan.

AMITY GROUP SPONSORS MEETING FOR PRC STUDENTS

OW131355 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1100 GMT 12 Jun 85

[Text] On 11 June, the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society sponsored a meeting of Chinese students at the House of Friendship for Peoples of All Nations in Moscow. The Chinese students are studying at higher education institutes in Moscow. Cordial conversations were conducted at the meeting.

Participating in the conversations were Lieutenant General (Kaliyagin), deputy chairman of the society's central board and a participant in the war of resistance against Japanese aggression, some board members of the society, and the board's responsible secretary (Kulikova). They talked about the traditional friendship between the Soviet and Chinese people established since the 1917 October Revolution. A documentary film was shown for the Chinese guests.

The meeting was held in a warm atmosphere.

NEW TIMES ASSESSES 1925-27 CHINESE REVOLUTION

PM140745 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No. 23, June 85 pp 22-23

[A. Kartunova article: "China: International Solidarity 60th Anniversary of the 1925-1927 Revolution"]

[Text] The 1925-27 anti-imperialist revolution, notable for its sweeping scale and mass character, was one of the most dramatic pages in the history of the Chinese people's liberation movement. It was preceded by the people's protest actions against interference and intervention on the part of the main forces of international imperialism - Britain, France, the U.S. and Japan - against the attempts to overthrow the progressive government headed by Sun Yatsen. The revolution was initiated by an anti-imperialist strike by workers, students and people from other walks of life which flared up in Shanghai in late May and early June 1925 (the May 30 movement).

On May 30 the police of the Shanghai international settlement opened fire on a mass worker and student demonstration. Already on May 31, Chinese Communists established the General Council of Shanghai Trade Unions, which called a general strike in Shanghai on June 1-2. Factory workers, 200,000 of whom went on strike, were the chief motive force of the anti-imperialist fight, made truly massive by the participation of students as well as the petty and middle bourgeoisie. The revolutionary events in Shanghai were a signal, as it were, for the outbreak of struggle in other parts of China. Demonstrations, meetings and strikes swept Beijing, Tianjin, Qingdao, Wuhan and other cities. That was actually the beginning of a revolt against foreign imperialists, Chinese militarists, feudal lords and the comprador bourgeoisie. Later, the bourgeoisie withdrew from active struggle but the insurgent people continued their fight, and it was only in 1927 that the forces of international imperialism and domestic reaction suppressed it.

From the very start, the Chinese revolution had the solidarity, support and assistance of the international working class and of progressives all over the world. That was of enormous importance for Chinese revolutionaries, for the Communist Party of China, which had been formed in 1921. The Communists were confronted by a multitude of extremely complicated national and class problems which would have been difficult to solve without the theoretical, ideological and organizational support of the international communist movement.

The young Communist Party of China drew upon the experience of the international communist movement, especially on the theses of the Communist International, on the need to set up in China a united democratic anti-imperialist front through the establishment of cooperation between the Communist Party and the Kuomintang Party (organizationally, the united front was to function in the framework of Kuomintang, with both parties remaining politically and organizationally independent) and on the character of the Chinese revolution as anti-imperialist and bourgeois-democratic, with the emphasis at the first stage on its nationwide character.

The multiform assistance rendered the Chinese revolution by the international communist and workers' movement not only inspired its participants to redouble their efforts, but brought home to the Chinese revolutionaries the efficacy of proletarian internationalism.

The international "Hands Off China!" movement, born in Soviet Russia, was a concrete form of international solidarity with, and support of, the Chinese revolution. Sun Yatsen highly appreciated this initiative. In a letter to the Chinese people he wrote: "Do not forget that the call 'Hands Off China!' first sounded over there in Russia. European capitalists might perhaps treat this slogan ironically, believing that it means nothing because the Soviet Union is so far away from China. But the fact is that the slogans issuing from Moscow know no distances. They spread all over the planet like wildfire and find a ready response in the heart of "every workingman."

After the interventionists shot down workers in Qingdao and Shanghai in April-May 1925, the "Hands Off China!" movement swept many countries.

The Communist International and its national sections, as well as the Trade Union International and the Young Communist International, had an important role to play in organizing the campaign of international working-class support for the revolutionary working people of China. They raised funds for striking Chinese proletarians, held meetings and demonstrations in support of the Chinese revolution, against imperialist interference in China's internal affairs, and organized other actions of international solidarity.

In June 1925, the All-China Federation of Trade Unions sent a letter to the Soviet trade unions, saying: "In our tough fight against world imperialism we have no greater source of strength than the fraternal moral and material assistance which the European and especially the Russian proletariat render us on such a wide scale. The united front of the working people of East and West is becoming a reality. This is the earnest of our coming victory."

The efficacy of the Soviet Union's aid and of international support by workers of other countries during the 1925-27 revolution was deeply appreciated in China. "In the course of the May 30 movement," a Chinese study of the events of those years says, "the Chinese people became profoundly aware of the fact that the Soviet Union and the proletariat of different countries are its real friends. Their sincere help, both moral and material, strengthened the Chinese people's determination and staunchness in its fight against imperialism."

Guided by the principles of internationalism and proletarian solidarity, the CPSU and the Soviet state rendered the Chinese people assistance and support at all stages of its revolutionary struggle. The record of history, including that of the revolutionary movement in China, shows that the strength of the internationalist solidarity of peoples is greatly augmented when they pool their efforts and fight together for national and social liberation, against the imperialist export of counterrevolution, and jointly uphold the cause of peace and social progress.

The nations fighting for their independence can always count on the internationalist solidarity of the CPSU, the Soviet state and our people. "Solidarity with the forces of progress and democracy, with the countries and nations upholding their freedom and independence in face of the onslaught of reactionary forces is a matter of principle for us," the April 1985 plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee pointed out. "In this respect, our line remains as clear-cut as ever."

JAPANESE DEFENSE CHIEF'S U.S. VISIT VIEWED

OW151203 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 14 Jun 85

[Andreyev commentary]

[Text] Listeners, Japanese Defense Agency (DA) Director General Kato is currently visiting the United States. In this connection, Radio Moscow commentator Andreyev writes:

Prior to DA Chief Kato's visit to the United States, Japan informed Washington of its readiness to take new measures to expand military cooperation. As usual, Japan had prepared a gift for the Pentagon chief, the U.S. defense secretary, and it turned out to be the 1986-90 5-year program for modernizing and building up Japanese forces.

Judging from a TOKYO SHIMBUN report, it has become clear that the DA chief himself intended to stress the fact that the DA attaches importance to enhancing its ability to conduct continuous combat and to strengthening its air and maritime defense, which the United States has long demanded of Japan. The DA director general felt that direct talks within the framework of his scheduled visit to the United States would be conducive to preventing negative influences on Japan's defense cooperation with the United States that might result from various problems in other fields, particularly trade and economic frictions.

However, the demands the U.S. side brought up at the conference table exceeded the concessions the Japanese side had planned to make. According to Defense Secretary Weinberger, Washington strongly demanded that the Japanese side accelerate its war preparations, which are rather insufficient, and that Japan promptly accept greater responsibilities by promoting expeditious military buildup in order to have full control, both on the sea and in the air, of the 1,000-mile sea lanes within the 1980's. Moreover, the U.S. side indicated that Japan should include a plan to enhance its combat readiness in its new 5-year defense buildup program.

The U.S. side also suggested that Japan transfer a large amount of its advanced military technology, particularly high technology that can be used in President Reagan's "star wars" program. Moreover, the United States demanded that Japan fully cooperate in realizing the "star wars" program. In support of this pressure, the U.S. Senate adopted a resolution covering all the demands proposed by Defense Secretary Weinberger, Secretary of State Shultz, and National Security Adviser McFarlane. At the same time, the Senate demanded that Japan assume a greater share of the defense responsibility and review its military programs so that more funds can be appropriated for building up air and naval forces capable of controlling the 1,000-mile sea lanes.

According to the KYODO news agency, Director General Kato promised that as a reliable ally of the United States, Japan would do its best to build up its air and naval defense capabilities. A positive answer was also given to the demand that Japan enhance its ability to defend the 1,000-mile sea lanes. DA Chief Kato stated Japan's desire to purchase from the United States such complicated weapons systems as the OTH (over the horizon) radar. Should this radar be used, it would be possible to conduct electronic spying over a vast area covering the Soviet Union and other neighboring states. The DA also wants to procure E-20 early warning aricraft, fighter interceptors, the Aegis-6 missile system, and others.

Correspondent Watanabe of MAINICHI SHIMBUN has reported from Washington that the Japanese side disclosed its intention to strengthen its defense cooperation with the United States and to further enhance the role of mutual cooperation in conducting world aggression. Furthermore, DA Chief Kato stressed the need to activate joint military exercises of the two countries and to work out joint military action programs. He also disclosed Japan's intention of providing military technology sought by the United States.

However, Washington is not satisfied with all these commitments made by the Japanese DA director general. Republican Senator Lugar asked DA chief Kato how Japan plans to assume greater responsibilities, and Democratic Representative Aspin stated that in the United States' view, Japan should spend much more on defense. At a press conference, DA chief Kato hinted that the U.S. demands were rather excessive and stated that the Japanese Government must take into consideration the sense of anxiety among the Japanese people over a sharp defense buildup. However, while complaining about the excessiveness of the U.S. demands, DA chief Kato remained tight-lipped on the fact that it was the Japanese ruling circles that motivated the United States to put forward these demands. It was none other than the Japanese ruling circles themselves that had taken the initiative in building up Japan's military capabilities and in protecting the so-called [words indistinct] profits of the United States in the 1,000-mile sea lanes. To carry out this initiative, Japan's military expenditure will soon exceed the 1 percent of GNP ceiling.

In this way, the Japanese ruling circles are drawing the country, step by step and without considering the dangerous outcome, into Washington's strategy of global confrontation. Moreover, Japan has stated its understanding of the "star wars" program, which will endanger peace, and has disclosed its readiness to participate in realizing the program. By subjugating itself to Washington's aggressive policy and further expanding its military exchanges with the United States to build up its military strength, Japan hopes to strengthen its influence in the NATO bloc, not only with its economic power but also with its military strength, and defuse its acute trade and economic frictions with the United States. Peace-loving public opinion in the Asia-Pacific region, including Japan, have noticed in this policy not only the possibility of an unlimited increase in military spending but also the danger of Japan being drawn into Washington's extremely dangerous military adventures in the Far East and the world as well.

TSVETOV ON KOICHI KATO'S ANTI-SOVIET STATEMENTS

LD132315 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1930 GMT 13 Jun 85

[Text] Koichi Kato, the head of the Japanese National Defense Agency, who is paying a visit to the United States, has made an anti-Soviet, militarist statement in New York. Political observer Vladimir Tsvetov comments:

Kato's speech came after his talks with U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger, Secretary of State Shultz and the U.S. President's national security adviser, McFarlane. Consequently, the patent anti-Sovietism and blatant militarism with which Kato's speech was imbued were a reflection of the spirit of his talks in Washington. Kato said that the build-up of Japanese military might, the strengthening of Japanese-U.S. links, and Japan's intention to take upon itself the so-called defense of maritime communications up to 1,000 nautical miles from its shores -- all this is aimed against the Soviet Union, which, Kato said, is intensifying its military preparations and threatening Japan.

The lie concerning the Soviet threat is obvious. In connection with Japan's concern over the security of its maritime communications, the Soviet Union proposed restricting the operations of navies in the Pacific basin, and extending confidence-building measures to this region. In order to remove any basis for mutual suspicion, the USSR stepped forward with an initiative for concluding a Soviet-Japanese treaty of goodneighborliness and cooperation. If Japan gave force of law to the three nonnuclear principles it has proclaimed -- nonproduction, nonacquisition, and nonimportation of nuclear weapons -- the USSR would undertake not to use nuclear weapons against Japan. The Japanese authorities rejected these Soviet proposals, and continue to speak of the Soviet threat.

The U.S. Administration strives to heap upon Japan as many obligations as possible in implementing anti-Soviet policy and desires to turn Japan into a strongpoint of aggression against the USSR. These are consequences of the overall essence of the United States hegemonistic foreign-policy course. Japan, for its part, accepts the role Washington allocates to it and plays up to U.S. anti-Sovietism. This is not only because revanchist circles exist in that country. By means of anti-Sovietism, the Japanese authorities hope to earn U.S. forgiveness for the huge surplus in the foreign trade balance between Japan and the United States, for its trade expansion in the U.S. market, and for refusing to allow the United States to penetrate Japanese markets.

It is possible that Japan will obtain U.S. forgiveness, and with it certain economic benefits, but in the long-term, complicity in the United States' aggressive, anti-Soviet strategy threatens Japan with the partial loss of its independence in foreign policy in peacetime, and with being turned into a target for a retaliatory strike if the United States unleashes military conflict in the Far East.

The Japanese democratic public realizes this. Kato's talks in Washington, and his irresponsible statement in New York, have evoked sharp criticism and decisive protests in Japan.

JAPANESE POLICY PLAYS INTO HANDS OF PENTAGON

LD142045 Moscow TASS in English 2012 GMT 14 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 14 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Askold Biryukov writes:

The Japanese public received with a considerable measure of concern the results of the latest U.S.-Japanese military consultations held in Washington at the level of heads of the military departments of the two countries. Japan has actually made no objections to any of the Pentagon's wishes and demands and pledged itself to fulfil them. It has been demanded that Japan should speed up its military preparations which Washington described as "insufficient", and head of Japan's military department Koichi Kato promised to do everything to turn Japan into a "reliable ally of the United States" capable of waging prolonged combat operations.

It has been demanded that Japan should speedily "widen responsibility" and build up its military might at such rates as would enable it to assume already in the 1980s "full control" over sea and air space in the area to 1,000 miles away from the coasts of Japan, even though the territories of sovereign states, Japan's neighbours, are within that zone.

Kato responded to these demands by presenting to the chief of the Pentagon rough drafts of the five year programme of the modernisation and buildup of Japan's armed forces for 1986-1990. Promising to increase sharply the fighting efficiency of Japan's air force and navy, he expressed the readiness to purchase from the United States such latest systems of armaments as a superlong-range beyond-the-horizon radar station with the use of which it would be possible to conduct electronic reconnaissance over vast areas of the USSR and other countries, Japan's neighbours, Ez-C early warning aircraft, Aegis missile systems for ships, etc.

The chief of Japan's Defence Agency expressed the readiness to strengthen the "defence cooperation with the USA" and "enhance by an order its significance in the global strategy" of the West, proclaimed the need for intensifying joint exercises and working out plans of joint combat operations. In answer to Caspar Weinberger's demand that Japan should supply the Pentagon with its latest technology, particularly such technology that can be used in the implementation of the programme of "star wars", Kato expressed the "understanding" for Reagan's concept of the United States' achieving "absolute" military superiority and proclaimed the intention to supply the United States with the requested Japanese military technology.

It is not accidental, the newspaper YOMIURI noted, that many people in Japan are critical about the results in the talks in Washington and believe that they "enhance the dangerous tension around Japan". It should also be added that this policy of the Japanese ruling circles is fraught with Japan's being involved in Washington's most dangerous military ventures in the Far East and all over the world.

Speaking in the Japanese Society in New York, Koichi Kato tried to justify the speeding up of the militaristic preparations in Japan by the need to counter the "Soviet military buildup" in the Far East, and he explained the raising of the level of military cooperation with the United States within the framework of the "security treaty" by the need of "deterring" the Soviet Union. The "arguments" of the head of Japan's military agency, the arguments that are nothing new, are clearly farfetched. Peace in the Far East is threatened not by the Soviet Union but by the aggressive strategy and large-scale military preparations of the United States. And the land of Hiroshima and Nagasaki which could contribute to the consolidation of peace is, instead of this, by the will of its ruling circles, playing into the hands of the adventurists from the Pentagon.

TASS: JAPAN 'DAZZLED' BY U.S. SPACE PLANS

LD130837 Moscow TASS in English 0714 GMT 13 Jun 85

["In Space Harness" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 13 TASS -- Ever since Washington came up with the idea of militarization of space the ruling circles of Japan have been showing the greatest interest in it among the allies of the USA. The newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA recalls in this connection that an agreement on Japan's participation in a project for building an orbiting station, a component of space arms, was signed with the American National Aeronautic and Space Administration in Tokyo early in May. The two sides held recently in Tokyo regular consultations concerning cooperation in military technology. Special emphasis was laid at these consultations also on joint development of means of warfare in space and from space.

Quoting the French newspaper LIBERATION, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA notes that the Japanese leaders seem to be dazzled by the glitter of the "gold vein" which, they think, military development of space is. They regard this as an opportunity for Japan to join the club of those possessing powerful "post-nuclear" arms systems and to regenerate it as one of the leading military powers of the world. They hope they would not be prevented from doing so either by the anti-war constitution, adopted after Japan's defeat in World War Two, or the anti-nuclear sentiments among Japan's population, sentiments nurtured by memories of the horrors of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It does not appear fortuitous that Prime Minister Nakasone described Reagan's militaristic initiative as "revolutionary".

DMITRIYEV ON JAPAN AS MAJOR U.S. NUCLEAR BASE

OW161413 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 15 Jun 85

[Dmitriyev commentary]

[Excerpts] A book entitled "Nuclear Battlefields" authored by William Arkin and Richard Fieldhouse, both experts on disarmament issues, has been published in the United States. In this book, the authors term Japan the largest U.S. nuclear base in the Pacific region. In its report on the book's publication, THE WASHINGTON POST writes: This book's purpose is to provide the public with sufficient material for high-level debates. It is bound to arouse turmoil in the U.S. Congress and Pentagon and trigger anti-nuclear demonstrations and FBI investigations. Such as THE WASHINGTON POST report. On the other hand, KYODO's report from Washington states that the Pentagon denounced the authors for revealing classified information. We will now broadcast a commentary by Radio Moscow commentator Dmitriyev.

Based on documents and without any fabrication, the book has described to what degree the United States has used Japan as its own nuclear base. It is precisely this point that has irritated the Pentagon. Numerous facts indicate that Japan has been consistently turned into an unsinkable nuclear-capable aircraft carrier. It has long been known to all that the United States, trampling on Japan's three non-nuclear principles, regularly dispatches its vessels loaded with Tomahawk nuclear cruise missiles to call at Japanese ports.

New facts indicating Japan's status as a U.S. nuclear launching pad have been pointed out in this book by American military experts. For example, Messrs Arkin and Fieldhouse have pointed out that the largest nuclear infrastructure in the Pacific region is being built in Japan. The high-frequency radio networks at Kadena Air Force Base on Okinawa as well as at Iruma and Tokorozawa in Saitama Prefecture can be used for coordinating U.S. actions during a nuclear war. According to the data cited in Arkin and Fieldhouse's book, Japan has 28 American nuclear support bases, ranking fifth in number after the NATO countries. All these facts indicate that the United States is actively engaged in preparing for nuclear wars in the Far East. The Pentagon pays no attention whatsoever to the non-nuclear principles supported by a large majority of the Japanese people. The authors of "Nuclear Battlefields" have clearly pointed out that the United States will introduce nuclear weapons into Japan in an emergency.

"Nuclear Battlefields" was published during Defense Agency Director General Kato's visit to the United States. Prior to this visit, defense chief Kato said Japan-U.S. military relations were entering a new stage. The new facts cited in the book by U.S. experts on disarmament issues indicate what this new stage signifies to Washington. That is, the United States will try harder than ever before to turn Japan into a hostage for its aggressive nuclear strategy.

MORE U.S. ARMS STOCKPILES IN JAPAN 'PROVOCATIVE'

PM161813 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Jun 85 Second Edition p 3

[V. Vinogradov "Military-Political Commentary": "Weapons for Aggression"]

[Text] It is already some time since General Wickham, U.S. Army chief of staff, ended his visit to Japan. Nonetheless we must return to his stay in the Land of the Rising Sun. Why? As the KYODO agency reported, during his talks with General Nakamura, chief of staff of the Japanese Ground Self-Defense Forces, the Pentagon emissary demanded that Tokyo grant the U.S. military department new areas of land for the creation of stockpiles of U.S. heavy arms. Above all it is proposed to set up these stockpiles on the northernmost Japanese island of Hokkaido, which is in direct proximity to Soviet borders.

Let us recall in this connection that this is not the first time that this question has been raised at Japanese-U.S. military meetings. Last fall, the newspaper TOKYO SHIMBUN wrote, the Pentagon and the Japan Defense Agency reached agreement on the creation of a "strategic store" of arms at the Sagamihara base in the Tokyo suburbs. In December 300 U.S. servicemen arrived at this site. From that moment combat hardware began to be shipped to Sagamihara, where it has been received and stored by these servicemen.

But then it became clear that the U.S. tanks, self-propelled guns, and missile systems are being stockpiled, so to speak, "in reserve." These arms will be permanently stored on Japanese territory and are intended for those military units from the interventionist Rapid Deployment Force which, according to the KYODO agency, the Pentagon intends to use in the Far East region in the event of notorious "emergency circumstances" breaking out.

Even then the Japanese press noted the danger of these actions by Washington and Tokyo. The U.S. plans, the newspaper ASAHI wrote in particular, attest that the U.S. strategists intend to allocate the same role to Japan that is fulfilled by the U.S. West European NATO bloc allies. In the FRG, for instance, the newspaper pointed out, the United States has adequate stores of combat hardware and military equipment to equip four U.S. divisions which will travel "light" from the United States to West Europe. The U.S. transfer of offensive arms to Japan, ASAHI summed up, is of strategic significance and is clearly provocative.

Now the same question is again being asked. As the newspaper YOMIURI reported, two infantry divisions -- the 9th, deployed in the continental United States, and the 25th, located in Hawaii -- are intended for immediate transfer to the Far East. Now the U.S. military is demanding that Tokyo grant new sites where it can stockpile additional consignments of combat hardware for these formations.

Bearing in mind the entire postwar history of mutual relations between Japan and the United States, which are typified by continual Japanese concessions in the military sphere, one can assume with no particular risk of being mistaken that the Pentagon will probably obtain what it is demanding. And this will mean that new stockpiles of U.S. combat hardware intended for carrying out the Reagan administration's aggressive plans will appear on Japanese soil in direct proximity to Soviet borders. There can be no doubt that the sinister plans for accumulating weapons in Japan for future aggressive acts and the steps already being taken in this direction can only lead to an exacerbation of the already complex military-political situation in the Far East.

TASS ON JAPAN' PLANS TO ACQUIRE AWACS SYSTEM

LD140539 Moscow TASS in English 0514 GMT 14 Jun 85

[Text] Tokyo June 14 TASS -- Tokyo plans to equip Japan's armed forces with a costly U.S. -made early warning and control systems (AWACS). To this end, the newspaper ASAHI writes, it is planned to purchase in the United States a batch of the latest aircraft equipped with high-power radars and electronic information processing systems. The move to acquire and introduce the AWACS system will become part of Tokyo's preparations for combat operations in the vast region of the north-western part of the Pacific. A report on the purchase of new aircraft appeared right after the negotiations between Koichi Kato, chief of Japan's National Defense Agency, and Caspar Weinberger, U.S. defense secretary, at which the Pentagon demanded that Tokyo tighten the so-called "air force control" over the Pacific Ocean lanes.

U.S. FOSTERS CLOSER JAPAN-ROK MILITARY LINKS

LD132326 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 13 Jun 85

[B. Andrianov commentary]

[Text] According to the Japanese paper NIHON KEIZAI, the Seoul dictator Chon Tu-hwan has expressed readiness to receive a Japanese naval squadron in a South Korean port at any time. Recently, the Nakasone government invited a South Korean naval force to call at Japanese ports. This visit, SANKEI SHIMBUN reports, will take place this autumn. I shall ask my colleague, Commentator Boris Andrianov, to give his opinion on this news:

Official Tokyo is trying to present the forthcoming appearance of South Korean warships off the shores of Japan as a protocol visit of friendship. There is nothing unusual in it, they say, because it is all in accordance with existing international traditions. However, sober-minded observers writing in certain organs of the Japanese press disagree with this interpretation. For example, in the opinion of SANKEI SHIMBUN the visit by a group of Seoul naval warships will become a cardinal step in establishing direct links between the armed forces of Japan and South Korea. Judging by appearances, this conclusion is based on an objective analysis of the facts, which shows that at present Tokyo and Seoul are regularly exchanging military information and holding consultations between the commands of the armed forces of the two countries. And now, in addition to that, they have started talks on regular exchange visits by warships, which, incidentally, the United States has strongly insisted on for a long time.

It turns out that the international traditions which official Tokyo refers to, have nothing to do with it. Basically, it boils down to the fact that the military rapprochement between Japan and South Korea is taking place within the framework of a program aimed at creating a new militarist alliance in the Far East. This has long been a plan of the politicians across the ocean. Up to now the United States has had bilateral military links with Japan and South Korea, brought about by the so-called security treaties which bind Tokyo and Seoul to Washington's Far East strategy. Now, however, the White House is striving to bring military cooperation between Japan and South Korea up to a higher level in order to complete the militarist Washington-Tokyo-Seoul triangle in the Far East that is designed to put pressure on the sovereign countries in the region by whipping up military hysteria there.

There is a completely new fact which confirms these very intentions. This week, the U.S. military command suggested to Tokyo that they hold joint U.S.-Japanese maneuvers over the Sea of Japan and the South Korean Peninsula. The very place chosen for these military exercises leaves no doubt that it is yet another demonstration of force being prepared near the borders of the DPRK and our country. It is intended to involve U.S. F-16 fighter-bomber units based in South Korea in the maneuvers. These combat aircraft are known to be carriers of nuclear weapons. According to the Japanese press, the U.S. military command views the holding of these maneuvers as a factor strengthening the policy of containment against the Soviet Union. The artificiality of such an explanation, if it may be so called, is quite evident since it sticks out like a sore thumb. It simply underlines the patently provocative nature of the militarist demonstration being schemed by Washington and Tokyo.

In light of this evident fact, the position taken by the Nakasone Cabinet appears quite peculiar. They verbally assure the Japanese public that they are striving to normalize the situation in the Far East and throughout the world; in fact they are agreeing to Japan's participation in maneuvers which will inevitably lead, as even government circles think, to a heightening of tension in the region. Thus, the Japanese authorities have again shown their readiness to drag their country still further into the policy of confrontation that Washington is pursuing. But can such zeal really be in Japan's national interests? Official Tokyo will hardly be able to give a candid answer to that question, which is being asked by the representatives of peace-loving circles of the Japanese public.

TASS: U.S. 'SPECIAL UNITS' TRAIN IN S. KOREA

LD151235 Moscow TASS in English 1109 GMT 15 Jun 85

[Text] New York June 15 TASS -- The United States has held the first exercises of special units from among the Seventh Infantry Division, which is intended for interventionist actions abroad, in the territory of South Korea in a situation approximated to a combat one. According to THE NEW YORK TIMES newspaper, an urgent airlifting and the conduct of punitive operations in a "hot spot" located at a great distance from U.S. territory were practiced during the militarist "games" held jointly with the South Korean Army. Special-purpose units were airlifted during the exercises from Fort Ord, California, to the south of the Korean peninsula to practice military operations "in enemy's rear areas."

THE NEW YORK TIMES emphasizes that the principal purpose of the new division which was breaking in in South Korea is to prepare to deliver quick strikes and to give support to U.S. armed forces which are already stationed abroad. The interventionist forces are being formed on orders from General John Wickham, chief of staff of the U.S. Army, one of the main characters in organizing the U.S. intervention in Grenada. According to the general, the Pentagon needs a new, mobile type of infantry force which could be used for rapid actions in the developing countries.

The Pentagon is already busy manning and training four such gendarme divisions each at a strength of more than 10,000 officers and men. THE NEW YORK TIMES points out that the troops are intended first of all for operations in Central American countries, in the Persian Gulf area, as well as in the Asian-Pacific region.

REPORTAGE, COMMENT ON AGCA TRIAL CONTINUES

TASS Issues Statement

LD141732 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1707 GMT 14 Jun 85

["TASS Statement" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 14 June (TASS) -- At the trial currently under way in Rome in connection with the attempted assassination of the head of the Catholic Church by the Turkish terrorist Agca several years ago, more and more new attempts are being made to fabricate monstrous accusations that the socialist countries were involved in this evil deed. The completely groundless accusations made against Bulgarian citizen S. Antonov, which were inspired by certain Western special services, like the whole trial itself, are a crude political provocation.

The shameful judicial farce, in which false evidence, slander, and mystic ravings are being piled up one on top of the other, is giving rise to indignation among Soviet and world public opinion and among all honest and sensible people.

According to reports from Rome, during the evidence at the trial, the Turkish neofascist Agca, who is appearing as the main "prosecution witness," has alleged that he supposedly maintained contact with Soviet diplomats in Sofia.

The absurdity of these inventions by the pathological liar strikes one forcibly. Nonetheless, in Rome a rostrum is still being provided for his insinuations, obviously only because someone across the ocean likes it. Can it be that in the Italian capital they do not see that this is striking at the country's prestige?

TASS is authorized to state the following: People in the Soviet Union are waiting for an end to be put to this unscrupulous venture aimed at poisoning the international atmosphere and at damaging relations between Italy and the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and the sooner it ends, the better.

CIA Involvement Alleged

LD161745 Moscow TASS in English 1612 GMT 16 Jun 85

[Text] Rome June 16 TASS -- The absurd charges of "Bulgarian connection" in the assassination attempt on Pope John Paul the Second were most crudely fabricated by Italian secret services and planted to hired killer Ali Agca. [sentence as received] This has been stated in an interview with the Italian weekly "L'ESPRESSO," by G. Pandico, one of the leaders of the Napolitano mafia "Camorra." A defendant at a current big trial of Mafia, he gave consent to cooperate with the Italian judiciary.

In 1982 Pandico together with Camorra boss R. Cutolo was serving his sentence in Ascoli-Piceno prison where Ali Agca was kept at that time. They quickly "made friends" with him. In March of the same year, Pandico told "L'ESPRESSO," it became known to us that Cutolo was to be transferred to another prison and that he was to be killed on the way there. The alarmed criminals decided to apply to their "friends" -- General Musumeci, who at that time held the post of deputy director of the Italian Military Information and Security Service (SISMI), and F. Pazienze, an international swindler, an agent of a number of Western secret services.

General Musumeci, Pandico goes on, met with Cutolo and me in Ascoli Piceno prison and proised to help us if we do him a service by making Ali Agca "repent" and give a "necessary testimony". He showed us a sheet of paper which listed the "motives of repentance" and a plan of action. It concerned the Soviet Union and Bulgarian citizens. Agca who was later summoned was told that Musumeci could "help" him and that everything could end in the best way for him. The SISMI-prepared document was read out to the Turk, and Musumeci made him sign it.

Pandico's interview confirms, writes the newspaper "L'HUMANITE", that the Turkish terrorist was thoroughly manipulated by Italian secret services. It is noted here that the participation in the operation by Musumeci and Pazienza, who are closely connected with U.S. intelligence services, proves that it was carried out on a direct instruction from the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency.

Vienna June 16 TASS -- "Ali Agca is a trained witness" is the headline under which the newspaper "VOLKSTIMME" carries an article in which it analyzes fabrications by the Turkish neofascist.

The prison "solitude" of Agca, who was sentenced to life imprisonment for the assassination attempt on the leader of the Roman Catholic Church, did not last long, the newspaper writes. There appeared rather many interlocutors who sought to "free him from boredom" and to tell him about his forthcoming role. Among them was, for example, the prison priest who himself is now under investigation on charges of connections with mafia. One of mafia leaders, Cutolo, as well as one of the leaders of the subversive terrorist grouping "Red Brigades", G. Senzani, conversed with the Turk in the prison cell. Representatives of Italian special services joined them later. Is it any wonder that Agca quite of a sudden came to know so much and could relate his role and the role of other persons in the assassination attempt on the pope? "VOLKSSTIMME" queries.

Dublin June 16 TASS -- One of the main distinguishing features of the current trial in Rome is a pronounced bias of the Italian judiciary. Absolutely trusted is terrorist Agca's completely false testimony on the strength of which the entire charge, which is being brought against Bulgarian citizen Sergey Antonov, of complicity in the assassination attempt is built. However, there is an utter lack of real evidence against him. This has been stated here by O'Bryan, a prominent Irish lawyer, who is the coordinator of a special committee to examine the "Antonov case". The commission has been set up within the framework of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers.

O'Bryan specially pointed out that it was only one and a half years after the crime in St. Peter's Square that Agca suddenly started to talk about a certain Bulgarian connection in the assassination attempt by naming Antonov as his accomplice. O'Bryan said that the commission discovered a close connection between representatives of the special services of Italy and the USA and American journalists who had trumpeted Antonov's involvement in the assassination attempt, such as Sterlin, Henze, and Ledin. They all have direct contacts with the CIA.

PONOMAREV LEADS SUPREME SOVIET DELEGATION TO SPAIN

LD161140 Moscow TASS in English 1053 GMT 16 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS -- A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet led by Boris Ponomarev, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU, secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, has left Moscow for Madrid for an official visit at the invitation of the General Cortes (parliament) of Spain.

The delegation includes Deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet Tamaz Gamkrelidze, Ivan Gladkiy, Vadim Zagladin, Vladimir Karpov, Pavel Naumov and Natalya Orlova.

At the airport the delegation was seen off by Vasiliy Kuznetsov, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU, first vice president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and other officials.

Among the send-off party was Spain's ambassador to the Soviet Union Jose Luis Xifra de Ocerin.

'Positive Changes' Noted

LD162112 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1835 GMT 16 Jun 85

[Text] Madrid, 16 Jun (TASS) -- The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation led by Boris Ponomarev arrived in the Spanish capital today. It was met by J.F. de Carvajal, president of the Senate (upper chamber) of the Spanish parliament, and other officials. Yu.V. Dubinin, USSR ambassador in Spain, was in the welcoming party. The leader of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation made the following statement at the airport:

Our USSR Supreme Soviet delegation has arrived in Spain at the invitation of the leadership of the Cortes Generales, and it expresses gratitude for this invitation. This visit by a Soviet parliamentary delegation is the first in the history of mutual relations between our countries. It is yet further evidence of the positive changes in Soviet-Spanish relations which have already taken a normal course. Business cooperation is being established and political contacts, including parliamentary contacts, are expanding. This corresponds to the interests of the peoples of both countries.

Last year we received Spanish senators in the Soviet Union as well as a delegation of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Congress of Deputies. The meetings and conversations that took place allowed parliamentarians of both countries to get to know one another, to become better acquainted with the situation in our countries, and to obtain first-hand information on all matters of interest. The foundation of the building of inter-parliamentary exchanges has been laid, so to say. We hope that the visit to Spain by our delegation will make it possible to discuss the state and prospects of Soviet-Spanish links and to continue the exchange of opinions on international problems.

Our delegation has arrived in Spain with an open heart and good intentions. The path followed in our relations shows that belonging to different sociopolitical systems is no hindrance to mutually advantageous cooperation on the basis of mutual respect for sovereignty and noninterference in one another's internal affairs. We intend to continue to develop relations between our countries on a healthy, stable basis, so that they are not dependent on any sort of fluctuations in the international situation. This is particularly necessary today, when the situation in the world has become markedly more complicated. The arms race has achieved vast proportions and now it is intended to extend it to space.

The need for joint efforts of all states to put an end to the present futile and dangerous confrontation is growing in the current conditions. Parliaments, which bear a high responsibility for the foreign policy of their states, should add their weight by speaking up on this matter. Speaking in the hospitable land of Spain, we would like to wish your people, toward whom Soviet people have for a long time sustained feelings of respect and sympathy, peaceful skies and a happy future.

SOUTH LEBANON ARMY RELEASES FINNISH UN TROOPS

LD151017 Moscow TASS in English 0955 GMT 15 Jun 85

[Text] Beirut June 15 TASS -- Hard-pressed by world public opinion, Israelis' henchmen from the puppet "South Lebanon Army" were compelled today to set free the group of Finnish servicemen from the U.N. Interim Force in Lebanon, who had been abducted by Tel Aviv's mercenaries on June 7 for the purpose of blackmail and in order to further exacerbated the situation in this Arab country.

OLIN ON ISRAEL'S WITHDRAWAL FROM LEBANON

LD122141 Moscow World Service in English 1710 GMT 12 Jun 85

[V. Olin commentary]

[Text] Israel has announced the completion of the withdrawal of its troops from Lebanon. Here is what our commentator, Viktor Olin, has to say in this connection.

Facts make it clear that Israel undertook the pull-out operation according to the principle: leave in order to remain. It has arbitrarily set up a so-called security zone in southern Lebanon, which is 20-25 kms wide, and left there a considerable number of its soldiers and officers as military patrols, advisers, observers and so on. The Israeli version of the rapid deployment forces is stationed near the Lebanese border. It can again invade the Arab country at the first call. Representatives of the Israeli leadership openly speak of the possibility of a new intervention. Grounds have been prepared for organizing provocations that could serve as a pretext for attacks. In the frontier security zone units of the so-called South Lebanon Army have been formed, trained, equipped and financed by Israel. The command of the army refuses to recognize the powers of the central Lebanese authorities and this results in constant tension in southern regions. At the end of last week the army staged another show of force by capturing 24 servicemen of the Finnish contingent of the United Nations force. An ultimatum was brought against the UN force command. It is not accidental that the incident took place several days before the so-called withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon. It is clear that the preservation of Lebanon as the hot spot in the Middle East meets the aims of the Israeli leadership and its strategic ally, the United States. The atmosphere of tension is used to justify the renunciation of truly fair and lasting settlements in the region and continue the occupation of a considerable section of Arab territory, depriving Palestinians of the right to self-determination and a state of their own. This quarantees conditions for implementing plans of building Greater Israel.

The Washington administration is also trying to use the situation to its own benefit. After it failed to consolidate and expand American military presence in Lebanon, it is again staking on diplomatic means in guarding so-called American vital interests in the Middle East. Secretary of State Shultz and other high-ranking U.S. officials recently visited several Middle East countries, but he could not propose anything new. The United States is still putting forward the aim of splitting Arab countries, pushing them to the path of separate deals with Israel and ruling the PLO out of the process of a Middle East settlement. The total inability to take the interests of others into account is characteristic of the Israeli and American policy in the Middle East. The latest developments in Lebanon convincingly prove this. The so-called Israeli troops' withdrawal has not deceived anyone. A spokesman for the Lebanese Government has said that the occupation can be considered complete only after not a single Israeli soldier is left in the territory of the country.

TASS: LEBANON LEADERS VIEW ISRAELI PULLOUT

LD131841 Moscow TASS in English k636 GMT 13 Jun 85

[Text] Beirut June 13 TASS -- The so-called "withdrawal" of the Israeli troops from south Lebanon is in effect a redeployment of the occupation troops, Amin al-Jumayyil, president of Lebanon, has stated. During a meeting with the U.N. Under-Secretary General for Special Political Affairs Brian Urquhart he pointed out the need to deploy units of the U.N. Interim Force and the Regular Lebanese Army in the border areas. The creation of the "security zone" which is put forward by Israel is unacceptable for Lebanon, he said.

'Adil 'Usayran, defense minister of Lebanon, stressed that the presence of Israeli military "advisers" on Lebanese soil meant the continuation of the occupation. Tel Aviv is actually trying to unilaterally put into practice the provisions of the notorious agreement of May 17, 1983, that was rejected by the Lebanese people. By preserving its military presence in the south of the country, Israel hopes to continue to interfere in the internal affairs of Lebanon with the aim to undermine its state foundations.

Contrary to the assertions of Tel Aviv on the conclusion of the withdrawal of its troops from Lebanon, Israel preserves reinforced positions in many key areas. Invaders' units in the Arnum-Yakhmur section have been reinforced with tanks and armoured vehicles. The Israelis continue to occupy the Beaufort fortress, and the Israeli flag is hoisted there.

Acting on the bidding of its patrons, the puppet "Army of South Lebanon" commits outrages. Its artillery again shelled the populated locatities of Jba', Jarju and Arab-Salim. In the area of Kfar-Falus the mercenaries provoked clashes with units of the patriotic forces. In the village of Al-Qantarah they staged a pogrom and plundered dozens of houses of the locals.

Men of the Lebanese patriotic resistance front mounted three combat operations against the invaders and their accomplices. Near the village or Majdal-Salim they attacked Israeli positions and fired at them from grenade-launchers and automatic weapons. In the area of the populated localities of Kfar-Rumman and Zaglah they attacked positions of the "Army of South Lebanon".

PRAVDA EDITORIAL ON SCIENTIFIC-TECHNICAL PROGRESS

PM141059 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 85 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Following the Course of Accelerating Scientific-Technical Progress"]

[Text] A conference on questions of accelerating scientific-technical progress was held at the CPSU Central Committee 11-12 June. M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, delivered a report on "A Fundamental Issue of the Party's Economic Policy." The report shows the Soviet economy's achievements and the need and possibility of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development on the basis of scientific-technical progress. Shortcomings and difficulties were revealed and ways and means of eliminating them were outlined. Tasks for the present and the long term were set.

Here it is not simply a case of increasing the national economy's growth rates but also of a new quality in our development, of a rapid advance in strategically important salients, of the structural reorganization of production, of a transition to an intensification footing, and of the in-depth restructuring of the economic mechanism and entire system of management.

Our successes in economic development are indisputable and universally recognized. This is yet another manifestation of the advantages of socialism and its planned economy. However, since the early seventies, certain difficulties have been experienced in economic development and they have arisen because persistence was not displayed promptly in reshaping structural policy [strukturnaya politika]; forms and methods of management, and the actual psychology of economic activity.

The party and the entire people have been faced with the task of overcoming negative tendencies and sharply improving matters. Society is faced with urgent tasks in improving food supplies and increasing the production of goods and services for the people. It is important to continue to construct housing extensively, to improve health care, and to expand education, science, and culture. At the same time, the need to accelerate socioeconomic development is generated by external circumstances, by the need to further consolidate the USSR's defense.

The task of accelerating the country's development has now acquired paramount political, economic, and social importance. Its implementation is an urgent matter for the entire party and the entire people.

Our party is preparing to greet its 27th congress and the congress program documents are being prepared. The main thing today is to seek out and put into operation all reserves for raising production efficiency and improving output quality. The reorientation of every enterprise and sector and the entire national economy to an intensive path of development is a vital necessity. Yet the leaders of a number of ministries are seeking to extract as many capital investments and as much resources as possible and receive plans that are as small as possible.

At present, the prime requirement is to reshape investment and structural policy and to shift the center of gravity from new construction to the retooling of enterprises, from increasing the extraction of resources to their all-around saving, and from the traditional buildup of production volumes to ensuring a sharp improvement in output quality.

It is important to unhesitatingly renounce the stereotyped form of economic management that arose in the past whereby the main method of expanding production was considered to be new construction, while many existing enterprises were not retooled for a long time. In the next few years, the proportion of funds earmarked for modernization must be increased from one-third to at least one-half of the total volume. It is necessary to investigate projects under construction attentively in order not to dissipate efforts and funds or sharply accelerate the installation of some while suspending or even mothballing others. At the same time, there must be a general inventory of existing fixed capital, a program for modernizing each enterprise and each sector must be outlined, and obsolete equipment must be replaced more rapidly with sophisticated equipment which will produce the maximum economic and social effect.

It is extremely necessary to employ an accelerated tempo to develop machine building, which plays a dominant and key role in the acceleration of scientific-technical progress. As early as the 12th 5-Year Plan, its growth rates must be increased 50-100 percent. A matter of special importance is to set up the mass production of equipment of new generations capable of providing a multiple increase in labor productivity and opening the way to the automation of all stages of the production process. Microelectronics, computer technology, and instrument building and the entire information industry are accelerators of progress under present conditions.

Great tasks must be resolved by the capital construction workers. This sector continues to lag behind. Inefficient use is also made of funds for the development of ferrous metallurgy, in the petrochemical and petroleum refining industry, and at chemical establishments. Even the plans must contain the most effective decisions, construction deadlines must be reduced, and equipment must be delivered to construction sites in complete sets and on time. Only then will planning decisions be promptly implemented and produce results. The greatest problem is the correlation between capital investments in the resource-extracting, processing, and consumer sectors. It is essential to resolutely improve the structure of capital investments and thus enhance their effectiveness.

To ensure the better use of what the country possesses, it is essential to mobilize organizational, economic, and social factors, to introduce order in everything, and to improve the organization of production. In every collective it is necessary to determine those links in which with minimum expenditure or indeed with no expenditure at all it is possible to obtain the greatest effect. The regime of thrift is the paramount task. This is a matter for the entire party and the entire people.

The improvement of the quality of output and its competitiveness on the world market is the most precise and widespread indicator of scientific-technical progress and labor standards and discipline. In recent years there has been some progress here. However, it must be admitted that the quality and technical-economic standard of articles remain a weak point of the economy. The quality of output should be a matter of not only professional but also national pride for Soviet people.

The frontline of the struggle to accelerate scientific-technical progress, the conference noted, passes through science. Soviet scientists' successes in various spheres of knowledge and technical progress are universally recognized. At the same time, our science must resolutely turn toward the needs of social production, while production must turn toward science. We must enhance the role and responsibility of academic sciences for the creation of the theoretical foundations of fundamentally new types of equipment and technology. An important reserve is to be found in VUZ science, whose potential is still not fully used.

The conference made serious complaints with regard to sectorial science. Hundreds of scientific research institutions are subordinated to the industrial ministries. Many of them are divorced from production and are not geared to achieving good end economic results. To overcome this alienation, it is expedient that many of the institutes and planning and design organizations be included in associations and enterprises immediately and for the plant sector of science to be thus enhanced. It is important to support more actively the work of inventors and rationalizers, to select important innovations more carefully, and to introduce them more rapidly into practice.

Life requires the in-depth restructuring of planning, management, and the entire economic mechanism. We must make even more in-depth and fuller use of the advantages of the socialist economy, make the economy as receptive as possible to scientific-technical progress, and ensure that all links of the national economy are vitally interested in this. We must move more rapidly from the larger-scale economic experiment to the creation of an integrated system of economic administration and management.

The task is set of substantially reducing the management apparatus in all echelons and of eliminating its redundant links and enhancing the role of the main production links: associations and enterprises. As a rule, they must be directly subordinated to ministries.

The restructuring of management must be linked to the intensification of autonomous financing and economic levers and incentives. We need a mechanism that really ensures advantages for those labor collectives that do accelerate scientific-technical progress and, at the same time, a mechanism that would make the production of obsolete and inefficient output disadvantageous.

The conference noted the need to eliminate everything outdated to ensure the full operation of the "anticost [protivozatratnyy] economic mechanism," which would literally rap the knuckles of careless economic administrators and of those who like to take as many resources and capital investments from the state as possible and give society as little as possible. In brief, very serious work lies ahead in improving management and economic administration because it is only by creating new economic and organizational conditions that we will be able to accelerate scientific-technical progress without delay.

The solution of this enormous task is inconceivable without profound changes in party work. This work deals with the decisive factor in all changes: the human factor. Hence, the main aim in the activity of party organizations today is to do everything to effect a breakthrough in the minds and mood of cadres from top to bottom by focusing their attention on the most important thing: scientific-technical progress. Exactingness and still more exactingness -- that is the main thing which the existing situation dictates to Communists.

It is essential to step up the demands made on economists, economic administrators, and engineering and technical and scientific cadres for the implementation of fundamental changes in the national economy. The party organizations are called on to step up party influence on the entire course of scientific-technical progress and to reinforce the party stratum in its determining sectors. The regular training and retraining of cadres is particularly topical now.

A vast field of activity is also opened up before ideological and propaganda work and before the press and radio and television broadcasting. They are called on to help persuade people that the acceleration of technical progress is a vitally important matter that accords with the interests of everyone and enables each person to reveal his abilities and talents.

The party is counting on enhancing cadres' competence, on the high degree of creative activity and skill of the working class, peasantry, scientists, and engineers, and on young people's daring, vigor, and searching minds and their growing interest in everything new and progressive.

The concluding year of the 5-year plan is under way. It is essential to successfully meet its targets and the 5-year plan as a whole, to be concerned for an all-around increase in the production of fuel and other raw material for industry, to organize agricultural work to a high standard, and to bring in and preserve the entire harvest. It is a case of embarking on the 12th 5-Year Plan with a good reserve.

In brief, Soviet people have a great deal of innovative, large-scale, difficult work ahead. It will require a large amount of mental work, strenuous labor, composure, and awareness from each person. Profound faith in the creative powers of workers, peasants, and the intelligentsia and in the people's high morale and will nurtures our party's optimism.

Resolving the entire package of tasks facing the Soviet people and our party is possible only under conditions of peace. The struggle to preserve and consolidate peace and to avert the danger of nuclear war remains the main principle of the CPSU's foreign policy.

Soviet people actively support the CPSU's policy. They link their hopes and aspirations with the ideas, initiatives, and plans with which the party is preparing for its 27th congress. Relying on the masses' creativity and strengthening the alliance of science and labor, the party is confidently steering toward the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development on the basis of scientific-technical progress.

SOVIET OFFICIAL SAYS SAKHAROV 'ALIVE AND WELL'

HK160302 Hong Kong AFP in English 0932 GMT 15 Jun 85

[Excerpts] Ottawa, June 15 (AFP) -- Dissident Soviet Physicist Andre Sakharov is not in Gorky anymore and "may be dead" the children of his wife Elena Bonner told a press conference at the human rights conference here on Friday.

Tatiana Yankelevich and Alexey Semyonov interpreted Mrs Bonner's reported return to Moscow of a package as her way of informing that the couple has been separated. Friends had sent the package to Mr Sakharov.

Svevolod Sofinskiy, the head of the Soviet delegation to the human rights conference, however, said that Mr Sakharov and his wife were "alive (and) well," Mrs Yankelevich said.

Mrs Yankelevich and Mr Semyonov, who live in the United States, have had talks here with several heads of Western delegations and with Canadian officials. They were scheduled to meet later Friday with Canadian External Affairs Secretary Joe Clark.